Version July 13, 2016
Preprint typeset using LaTeX style emulateapj v. 08/22/09

arXiv:1607.03440v1 [astro-ph.EP] 12 Jul 2016

STUDY OF A POTENTIAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TWO LONG-PERIOD COMETS AND RAPID INWARD DRIFTING OF APHELION DUE TO ORBITAL-CASCADE RESONANCE

Zdenek Sekanina[1] & Rainer Kracht[2]
[1]Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, 4800 Oak Grove Drive, Pasadena, CA 91109, U.S.A.
[2]Ostlandring 53, D-25335 Elmshorn, Schleswig-Holstein, Germany

Version July 13, 2016

ABSTRACT

We study a potential genetic relationship of comets C/1846 O1 and C/1973 D1, whose apparent orbital similarity was tested by Kresák (1982) only statistically, using the Southworth-Hawkins (1963) criterion D. Our orbit determination for C/1846 O1 shows its period was ∼500 yr, ∼30 times shorter than that of C/1973 D1. Formerly unrecognized, this incongruity makes the objects' common origin less likely. Long-term orbit integration suggests that, if related, the two comets would have to have separated far away from the Sun (probably ∼700 AU) 21 millennia ago and, unlike C/1973 D1, C/1846 O1 would have to have been subjected to a complex orbital evolution. Given the chance of encountering Jupiter to ∼0.6 AU some 400 days after perihelion, C/1846 O1 and C/1973 D1 may have been perturbed, during their return in the 15th millennium BCE, into orbits that were, respectively, smaller and larger than was the parent's, with a net difference of more than 0.002 $(\mathrm{AU})^{-1}$ in $1/a$. Whereas C/1973 D1 was on the way to its 1973 perihelion, C/1846 O1 should have been subjected to recurring encounters with Jupiter, during which the orbital period continued to shorten by integral multiples of the Jovian orbital period, a process called *high-order orbital-cascade resonance*. While the integrated perturbation effect of C/1846 O1 by Jupiter does not appear to reduce the comet's orbital period to below ∼1200 yr by the mid-19th century, we find that orbital-cascade resonance offers an attractive mechanism for rapid inward drifting of aphelion especially among dynamically new comets.

Subject headings: comets: general — methods: data analysis

1. INTRODUCTION

We recently expounded the relationship between fragmentation and the orbital properties for two well-known groups of genetically related long-period comets: one was the pair of C/1988 F1 (Levy) and C/1988 J1 (Shoemaker-Holt) and the other was the trio of C/1988 A1 (Liller), C/1996 Q1 (Tabur), and C/2015 F3 (SWAN) (Sekanina & Kracht 2016, referred to hereafter as Paper 1). Prior to the discovery of the two groups, a genetic relationship as the provenance for close orbital similarity among comets was a subject of controversy, especially in the 1970s and early 1980s. In a contribution to the debate, Kresák (1982) corroborated and extended Whipple's (1977) criticism of Öpik's (1971) conclusion on the omnipresence of groups of related comets. Kresák argued that there was no compelling evidence for the existence of a single pair or group of long-period comets that derive from a common parent, other than the Kreutz system of sungrazers.

The approach employed in the pre-1988 debate was always statistical in nature. In particular, Kresák (1982) used a D-criterion, introduced by Southworth & Hawkins (1963) in their investigation of meteor streams. As a function of differences in the five orbital elements — the argument of perihelion ω, the longitude of the ascending node Ω, the inclination i, the perihelion distance q, and the eccentricity e — the D-criterion allows one to express the degree of similarity between two orbits in one-dimensional phase space. Objects in orbits of the same spatial orientation that are identical in size and shape have $D = 0$. The D-values of the genetically related 1988 pair and the 1988–2015 trio, referred to above, are listed in Table 1. They never exceed ∼0.008, just as the D-values for the Kreutz system's most tightly associated members (such as C/1882 R1 and C/1965 S1).

The prime subject of Kresák's study was a distribution of D-values among 546 comets [a majority extracted from Marsden (1979) and several added] that arrived at perihelion before the end of 1980 and whose orbital periods exceeded 200 years; the Kreutz sungrazers were excluded. After finding 38 pairs (and several chains) of comets with $D < 0.3$ and comparing them with three independent distributions of 546 randomly generated orbits (accounting in part for observational selection effects), Kresák concluded that the set of long-period comets exhibited no signs of nonrandom distribution. In particular, he judged orbital similarity of the comet pair with the least D-value of 0.084 — C/1846 O1 (de Vico-Hind) and C/1973 D1 (Kohoutek) — not to be statistically significant on the grounds that comparison with the least D-values in the random samples, 0.101–0.120, suggested, on the average, a ∼20% expectation that this was a random pair as well.

Unfortunately, Kresák's failure to remove from his statistics the grossly inferior orbits of comets observed in early times marred his main results, and he addressed a much more meaningful subset of 438 long-period comets from the period of 1800–1980 rather inadequately. Our closer examination of this subset shows that the minimum D-value in the three random samples then moves up to a range of 0.113–0.134 and there is only an 11% expectation for C/1846 O1 and C/1973 D1 being a random pair. Moreover, if this pair is removed from the set, the next pair's D-value of 0.129 is consistent with an average random sample with an expectation of 60%.

Electronic address: Zdenek.Sekanina@jpl.nasa.gov
R.Kracht@t-online.de

Table 1
D-criterion for Members of the 1988 Pair and 1988–2015 Trio of Genetically Related Comets

Comet Group	Members	*D*-criterion
1988 pair	C/1988 F1 ⇔ C/1988 J1	0.00029
1988–2015 trio	C/1988 A1 ⇔ C/1996 Q1	0.0033
	C/1988 A1 ⇔ C/2015 F3	0.0082
	C/1996 Q1 ⇔ C/2015 F3	0.0081

Interestingly, in an investigation that extended that of Kresák (1982), Lindblad (1985) found that an updated set of long-period comets displayed, at best, only marginally greater orbital similarity than did random samples.

From the statistical standpoint, the pair of C/1846 O1 and C/1973 D1 appears to be something of an oddball; at first sight, the orbital differences are not so plainly minute as those of obvious fragments of a common parent (as, e.g., C/1988 F1 and C/1988 J1; Table 2), yet they are not conforming to a random distribution so readily as the other fortuitous pairs on Kresák's (1982) list. Comparison of the 1846–1973 pair's *D*-value of 0.084 with those in Table 1 suggests that this pair is orbitally bound together one order of magnitude less tightly than the 1988–2015 trio and two orders of magnitude less tightly than the 1988 pair. On the other hand, it should be emphasized that some members of the Kreutz system, although genetically related beyond any doubt, have orbits far less similar and their *D*-values much larger than the 1846–1973 pair. For example, $D = 0.223$ for the pair of C/1963 R1 (Pereyra) and C/1965 S1 (Ikeya-Seki), both Kreutz sungrazers with very accurately determined orbits, although classified by Marsden (1967) as members of different Kreutz subgroups.

In Paper 1 we noted that the 1988 pair (C/1988 F1 and C/1988 J1) was with high probability a single comet less than one half the orbital period before discovery, while the parent of the 1988–2015 trio was likely to have split near the previous perihelion passage. The process of fragmentation of the Kreutz system began at least two (Sekanina & Chodas 2004) and possibly many more (Marsden 1989; Öpik 1966) revolutions about the Sun before the 19th and 20th century clusters were observed.

Table 2
Orbital Differences for Comets in Pairs Near Perihelion[a]

Difference in element	C/1846 O1 minus C/1973 D1	C/1988 F1 minus C/1988 J1	C/1988 A1 minus C/1996 Q1	C/1988 A1 minus C/2015 F3
ω	+3°.8919	−0°.00007	−0°.02459	−0°.17906
Ω	−1°.3535	+0°.00018	+0°.11529	−0°.12355
i	+0°.7789	+0°.00086	−0°.03387	−0°.06440
q (AU)	−0.006027	−0.0002895	+0.0015280	+0.0068817
e	+0.001277	−0.0000144	−0.0021174	+0.0001177

Note.
[a] The elements are taken from Marsden & Williams (2008) for the first pair and from Paper 1 for the other pairs. The errors involved are unknown, but — with possible exceptions of the perihelion distance and eccentricity — smaller than the differences for the first pair; unknown, but at worst comparable to the differences for the second pair; and at least one order of magnitude smaller than the differences for the last two pairs.

It appears that the *D*-criterion, as a measure of orbital similarity, increases with the time elapsed since the fragmentation event, a trend that is by no means surprising.

By the same token, however, the *D*-criterion proves an unreliable tool in an effort to investigate a genetic relationship between two particular comets of unknown histories, and for other than statistical purposes appears to be useless. Indeed, in meteor astronomy — for which the *D*-criterion was developed — its application is limited to statistical studies only and is therefore fully justified.

This experience suggests that a much more rigorous approach — pursued below — is required in order to gain insight into the fundamental issue of our interest: *Are comets C/1846 O1 and C/1973 D1 genetically related?*

2. PUBLISHED OBSERVATIONS AND ORBITS OF C/1846 O1 AND C/1973 D1

Comet C/1846 O1 was discovered independently by F. de Vico in Rome and by J. R. Hind in London on 1846 July 29, some 2 hours apart (de Vico 1846; Bishop 1852). The comet was observed astrometrically for about two months, in September until the 26th only by Argelander (1865) in Bonn. The orbit in Marsden & Williams' (2008) catalog was computed by Vogel (1868); although the best in existence at this time, the orbit is only a parabola with no planetary perturbations applied and is clearly inadequate for an in-depth investigation of the comet's motion. No physical observations were made, and the comet's intrinsic brightness published by Vsekhsvyatsky (1958),[1] $H_{10} = 6.2$, is an estimate based on apparent magntidues assigned depending on the reported type and size of instruments large enough or too small to detect the comet.[2]

Comet C/1973 D1 was discovered photographically by Kohoutek (1973a) in Hamburg-Bergedorf on 1973 February 28 and observed astrometrically for nearly 7 months, for the last time on September 22 by the discoverer (Kohoutek 1973b). The comet's astrometry is summarized (including the references) in the Minor Planet Center's Orbits/Observations Database.[3] Marsden (1973) noticed orbital similarity with C/1846 O1 from an early parabolic orbit based on a 5.9-days long arc, but it took much more time to rule out the identity of the two comets (Marsden 1974). The currently available high-quality orbit, computed by Marsden, reveals that the comet has last been near the Sun some 16 500 years ago (Marsden et al. 1978). Brightness estimates are the only physical observations that are available:[4] a series obtained visually by Bortle (1982) before perihelion and a number of approximate total and "nuclear" photographic magnitudes (e.g., Kojima 1973, Kohoutek 1973b) that span almost the entire period of astrometric observations.

[1] A so-called absolute magnitude H_{10} is related to an apparent magnitude H according to a formula $H_{10} = H - 5 \log \Delta - 10 \log r$, where Δ and r are, respectively, the comet's geocentric and heliocentric distances; this formula reflects an assumption that the comet's observed brightness varies as $\Delta^{-2} r^{-4}$.

[2] For example, describing the comet on 1846 July 30, Hind remarked that it "could be just perceived with the ordinary sea-glass" (Bishop 1852, p. 217). The assigned H_{10} magnitude of 6.2 is readily obtained by ascribing a limiting magnitude of 9.5 to a glass of 30 mm aperture diameter and a magnification of 8× at the comet's elevation of 25–30° above the horizon.

[3] See `http://www.minorplanetcenter.net/db_search`.

[4] In at least one case the physical observations that referred to C/1973 E1 (Kohoutek) were mistakenly assigned to C/1973 D1 (Combi et al. 1997).



Figure 1. Light curve of C/1973 D1 based on the observations by Bortle (1982). The visual magnitude H_Δ, aperture corrected and normalized to a unit geocentric distance by an inverse square power law, is plotted against time (reckoned from perihelion) on the left and against heliocentric distance on the right. The fitted polynomial of power 4 (on the left) suggests that the comet's normalized brightness may have peaked before perihelion and that the rate of preperihelion brightening with heliocentric distance (on the right) dropped rapidly around 1.5 AU from the Sun, in late April, when the comet had ∼42 days to go to perihelion. An extrapolated intrinsic magnitude, H_5, based on the assumption of validity of an inverse square power law near perihelion amounts to 9.3 ± 0.1.

To address the issue of which of the two comets is likely to be intrinsically fainter, we now examine the light curve of C/1973 D1. Based on Bortle's (1982) brightness estimates, spanning more than 70 days, from 1973 March 24 to June 3, and terminating a few days before perihelion, the light curve is plotted in Figure 1. The observed magnitudes H were first corrected for the aperture of the employed 31.6-cm reflector by subtracting 0.6 mag (Morris 1973) and thereby standardized to a photometric scale of the naked eye.[5] The corrected magnitudes $H_{\rm corr}$ were converted to H_Δ by normalizing to a geocentric distance of $\Delta = 1$ AU with an inverse square power law, i.e., $H_\Delta = H_{\rm corr} - 5 \log \Delta$. No phase correction was applied, because in the entire period of Bortle's observations the phase angle varied only between 25° and 38°. However, if reduced to a zero phase angle, the data in Figure 1 could be a few tenths of a magnitude brighter.

The normalized magnitude variations of C/1973 D1 in Figure 1 show no sign of flare-ups, but a polynomial fit of power 4 suggests that the light curve peaked about 20 days before perihelion. However, the last observation, made 4 days before perihelion, may have been affected by a small elongation from the Sun, which was only 36°. There was a marked tendency for the light curve to level off as the comet was approaching perihelion. Down to a heliocentric distance r of about 1.5 AU, the comet brightened steeply, approximately as r^{-7}. If this trend continued, the comet's extrapolated normalized magnitude at $r = \Delta = 1$ AU would have been about 7. The rate at which the brightness was increasing at $r < 1.5$ AU is not at all well determined, but assuming, conservatively, an inverse square power law, the extrapolated normalized magnitude at a unit heliocentric and geocentric distances is $H_5 = 9.3 \pm 0.1$ (Figure 1).

[5] Morris (1973) determined an aperture correction for reflectors to average -0.019 mag cm^{-1}, applying a correction of -0.47 mag to reduce Bortle's 31.6-cm reflector magnitudes to a standard aperture of 6.8 cm (equivalent to -0.6 mag for the naked eye). With reference to their correspondence, Morris stated that Bortle's own aperture correction was practically identical.

An average r^{-4} fit implies an absolute magnitude of $H_{10} = 8.2 \pm 0.3$, 2 mag fainter than C/1846 O1. However, such comparison is questionable because C/1846 O1 was discovered nine weeks after perihelion, while the Bortle light curve refers to the time before perihelion. The difference should in fact be still greater, if C/1973 D1 was intrinsically fainter after perihelion. If Hind's remark on the marginal appearance of C/1846 O1 in a sea-glass on 1846 July 30.9 UT, 65 days after perihelion, is indeed interpreted to imply magnitude 9.5, we find for this comet — neglecting a small aperture correction of perhaps -0.2 mag — that $H_\Delta = 8.3$ at $r = 1.65$ AU and a phase angle of 35°. On the other hand, C/1973 D1 was photographed by Kohoutek (1973b) on 1973 August 1.0, 55 days after perihelion, as an object of total magnitude 15, equivalent to $H_\Delta = 13.7$ at $r = 1.59$ AU. Since photographic observations underestimate the total brightness compared to visual data, we need to correct for this effect by comparing them with Bortle's preperihelion observations. Although Kohoutek photographed C/1973 D1 several times between March 24 and June 3, he provided no magnitudes on those occasions. The only total photographic magnitudes[6] from the critical time span were magnitude 14 by Wood at Woolston on March 22.8, magnitude 15 by Mrkos at Klet' on April 4.9 UT, and magnitude 14 by Hendrie at Woolston on April 6.9 UT. Comparison of the two consistent results with $H_{\rm corr}$ from Bortle's data yields a photographic-to-visual correction of -2.6 mag, which — if assumed to be approximately applicable also to Kohoutek's magnitude scale — implies for his corrected post-perihelion data point $H_\Delta = 11.1$ at $r = 1.59$ AU, that is, 2.8 mag fainter than C/1846 O1 at a slightly larger heliocentric distance. This essentially 3 mag difference, whose uncertainty is estimated at some ± 0.5 mag, suggests that if the two comets are genetically related, then C/1846 O1 is likely to be the primary and C/1973 D1 its companion, a conclusion that will serve as a test in our orbit-evolution modeling.

[6] See a website `http://www.minorplanetcenter.net/db_search`.

3. STRATEGY OF THE PRESENT INVESTIGATION

To address our primary objective — the relationship between the two comets — requires a comprehensive examination of the histories of their orbital motion and an in-depth study of their common parent's most probable motion. This general strategy consists of several consecutive steps, dealt with in the following subsections.

3.1. *Possible Fragmentation Scenarios*

If C/1846 O1 and C/1973 D1 should be fragments of a common parent, their arrival times at perihelion and the other elements must satisfy certain conditions depending on the parent's fragmentation time. One fundamental property of the groups of genetically related long-period comets (and nontidally split comets in general) that C/1846 O1 and C/1973 D1 appear to satisfy is that the primary (intrinsically the brightest and presumably the most massive) fragment should arrive first. Based on our experience that we gained from our study of a pair and a trio of genetically related long-period comets in Paper 1, the possible scenarios for the timing of the parent's fragmentation could be divided into three general categories: (A) relatively recently, a fraction of one revolution about the Sun before their recorded perihelion times in the 19th–20th centurues; (B) in a general proximity of perihelion in the previous return; or (C) substantially earlier than in the course of the previous return to perihelion.

The first scenario — a relatively recent event — is practically ruled out for two reasons. One is the unacceptably long period of time — 127 years — between the arrival times of the two comets at perihelion, the other is the large differences between their other elements, as illustrated in Table 2. Indeed, adopting the original orbital period of C/1973 D1, computed by Marsden (Marsden et al. 1978), as a first approximation to the parent's orbital period and ignoring the planetary perturbations, we find (from the equations provided in Section 2.1.1 of Paper 1) that the fragmentation event would have taken place at a heliocentric distance of about 127 AU, some 110 years after the previous perihelion passage or ∼16 400 years ago. Thus, the assumption of a fragmentation scenario of category (A) results in a scenario of category (B).

On the same premise of the parent moving in an orbit with a period of ∼16 500 years, scenario of category (B) is self-consistent. In particular, as shown below, it satisfies the basic relationship between the separation velocity and the difference of 127 years in the two comets' arrival times, dictated by Equation (2) of Paper 1. Replacing the component of the separation velocity along the orbital-velocity vector, ΔV, with the statistically averaged separation velocity, $\langle V_{\rm sep} \rangle$ [see the text in Paper 1 near Equation (26)], we find on these assumptions for the presumed pair of C/1846 O1 and C/1973 D1:

$$\langle V_{\rm sep} \rangle = 0.36\,(r_{\rm frg}/q)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \qquad (1)$$

where $r_{\rm frg}$ is the heliocentric distance at the fragmentation time (in AU) and $q = 1.382$ AU is the perihelion distance; the separation velocity comes out to be in m s^{-1}. This equation suggests a plausible submeter-per-second separation velocity near perihelion and a still acceptable separation velocity of just below 3 m s^{-1} at the 127 AU from the Sun, mentioned above.

It appears that the 127-year gap between C/1846 O1 and C/1973 D1 is consistent with the same straightforward explanation that accounted for the 1988-2015 trio in Paper 1, and that therefore the 1846-1973 pair is, too, genetically related. There are only two potential problems: (i) a major difference of more than 3° in the argument of perihelion between the two apparent fragments of the same parent and (ii) the premise that the parent — and therefore also C/1846 O1 — had an original orbital period of 16 000 to 17 000 years, close to that of C/1973 D1; both points are so critical to the relationship issue that an in-depth investigation of the orbital motion of C/1846 O1 was absolutely indispensable.

3.2. *Improving the Orbit for C/1846 O1*

Because the orbit derived by Vogel (1868) is so highly unsatisfactory, our goal was to compute an improved solution from scratch, using Vogel's references to the publications with the original astrometric positions. We considered it desirable to replace these with new positions based on comparison-star positions from the *Hipparcos* or *Tycho-2* catalogs.[7] Our effort was first directed toward ascertaining, for each published observation, the comet's offsets in right ascension and declination from the comparison star as well as toward identifying the star.

Vogel (1868) collected 40 astrometric observations that were made at nine sites. Consulting the original references, we soon found that of the 11 positions measured by Hind at Bishop's Observatory in the Regent's Park section of London (Bishop 1852), eight were not obtained by micrometric comparison with a field star, but by reading the circles of the equatorial (referred to in the publication as "instrumental positions"). We excluded these from the data set because of their inherent low accuracy. In addition, because of incomplete information available, we could neither determine the offsets from the comparison star measured by J. Challis (Hind 1846) at Cambridge (U.K.) on July 30 nor identify the comparison star used by E. J. Cooper (Graham 1846) at Markree on August 31. For the remaining 30 observations we were able to recover both the comparison stars and the offsets. In addition, we also were able to identify, in the *Tycho-2* catalog, comparison stars for two observations, for which Vogel was lacking information and did not include them in his data set. We thus ended up with a total of 32 rereduced and updated astrometric positions for our orbit determination.

An *EXORB7* code, written by A. Vitagliano and in possession of the second author, was employed to carry out the computations. The code accounts for the perturbations by the eight planets, by Pluto, and by the three most massive asteroids; and it applies a differential least-squares optimization procedure to compute the orbital elements. We began by fitting all 32 observations, of which three, found to be fundamentally incorrect, leaving residuals in excess of 80″, were immediately discarded; comparison with Vogel's (1868) paper showed that these were the same observations that gave similarly unacceptable residuals from his preliminary orbit.

[7] The search facilities are available at the following websites: `http:// www.rssd.esa.int/index.php?project=HIPPARCOS&page=hipsearch` for the *Hipparcos* (and the original *Tycho*) catalog and `http://vizier.u-strasbg.fr/viz-bin/VizieR-2?-source=I/259/tyc2&-out.add=` for the *Tycho-2* catalog.

Table 3
Osculating Orbital Period of Comet C/1846 O1 As Function of Rejection Cutoff[a]

Residual at rejection cutoff	Number of observations	Osculating orbital period (yr)	Mean residual
36″	29	384 ± 120	±10″.9
30	28	350 ± 98	±10.0
24	26	678 ± 285	±8.6
18	23	682 ± 265	±7.3
12	16	638 ± 194	±5.1
6	11	504 ± 83	±2.8

Note.
[a] Osculation epoch of 1846 July 30.0 TT.

An elliptical solution was then found that satisfied the remaining 29 positions with a mean residual of ±10″.9, but showed that one observation left a residual exceeding 3σ. Next we applied progressively tighter rejection cutoffs from 30″ down to 6″, paying particular attention to variations in the osculating orbital period as a function of the rejection cutoff. The results, exhibited in Table 3, suggest that the osculating orbital period $P_{\rm osc}$ was nominally always between 350 yr and 700 yr, that 250 yr $< P_{\rm osc} <$ 1000 yr at 1σ, and that $P_{\rm osc} <$ 1600 yr at 3σ. This result is significant for two reasons: one, it shows that a parabola, as employed by Vogel (1868), is an unacceptable approximation; and, two, indicates that this comet revolves about the Sun ∼10 or more times in the same period of time in which C/1973 D1 makes just a single revolution. This major discrepancy and its implications will be addressed in greater detail in Section 3.4.

Table 4 offers our preferred orbital solution for comet C/1846 O1, computed for a standard 40-day epoch of osculation at a rejection cutoff of 6″. Relative to Vogel's (1868) orbit, we note — besides the major deviation from a parabola — significant differences in the other elements as well, amounting to about 10 times the mean error: the perihelion time 1.4 days earlier, the argument of perihelion 1°.3 lower, the longitude of the ascending node and the inclination (reckoned relative to the normal to the ecliptic plane) both more than 0°.2 higher, and the perihelion distance more than 0.02 AU smaller. The distribution of residuals from all 32 observations is presented in Table 5; the rejected observations are parenthesized.

3.3. *New Orbit for C/1973 D1*

Although we considered taking Marsden's definitive orbit based on 38 observations (Marsden et al. 1978; also Marsden & Williams 2008) as a starting set of elements for further computations, we eventually decided to recompute the orbit for two reasons. One, we preferred a very tight rejection cutoff for the residuals and were uncertain of what cutoff was applied by Marsden in his solution. More importantly, we were bent on estimating and/or constraining the magnitude of the nongravitational effects on the motion of the comet, given its feeble intrinsic brightness (Figure 1), for which we had to get involved with fitting the observations anyway. We collected 42 astrometric observations from the Minor Planet Center's database (Section 2) and from the first orbital run we established that the residuals from four observations exceeded 3″, which thus was the rejection cutoff chosen by Marsden. We tested solutions at the rejection cutoffs of 2″.5 (with 34 observations surviving) and at 2″ (with 31 observations), and adopted the latter solution for further investigation of the comet's orbital evolution. This set of elements is presented in Table 4, while the residuals from all 42 observations are in Table 6, the rejected ones again parenthesized. A high degree of similarity between this orbit and that by Marsden is apparent from the small differences in the individual elements, but thanks to the tighter rejection cutoff, the mean errors of our orbital elements are nearly a factor of two lower than Marsden's (Marsden et al. 1978). The differences in the sense "Marsden orbit minus orbit in Table 4" and the mean errors of the Marsden orbit are: $+0.00079 \pm 0.00065$ day in the perihelion time, $+0°.00045 \pm 0°.00040$ in the argument of perihelion, $+0°.00001 \pm 0°.00007$ in the longitude of the ascending node, $-0°.00010 \pm 0°.00017$ in the inclination, $+0.0000030 \pm 0.0000045$ AU in the perihelion distance, and $+0.0000192 \pm 0.0000182$ in the eccentricity. These differences appear to be comparable to the mean errors of the Marsden set of elements. On the other hand, for five of the six elements the differences are clearly larger than the mean errors of our set of elements in Table 4; on the average the ratio of the difference to the mean error is 1.55.

We also investigated the distribution of residuals from the solutions with the rejection cutoffs of 3″ and 2″ and found that the residuals differed systematically by up to 0″.6 in right ascension and by up to 0″.3 in declination. Since these residuals reflect differences of 1.55 times the mean error of the elements, we considered as acceptable only systematic residuals between the two sets of up to 0″.2 in right ascension and up to 0″.1 in declination, equivalent, on the average, to deviations in the orbital elements of up to 0.5 their mean errors.

We were now ready to investigate the effects of the nongravitational acceleration, employing the standard Style II formalism introduced by Marsden et al. (1973). We examined separately the effects due to a radial component (with an amplitude of A_1 at 1 AU from the Sun), a transverse component (with an amplitude A_2), and a normal component (an amplitude A_3). We obtained specific orbital solutions by forcing two different magnitudes of the nongravitational accelerelation, found that the peak residuals varied in proportion to the acceleration's amplitude, and concluded that each of the three components made the fit unacceptable by increasing the systematic residuals beyond the allowed levels unless

$$\begin{aligned} |A_1| &< 0.45 \times 10^{-8}\ \mathrm{AU\ day^{-2}}, \\ |A_2| &< 0.15 \times 10^{-8}\ \mathrm{AU\ day^{-2}}, \\ |A_3| &< 0.10 \times 10^{-8}\ \mathrm{AU\ day^{-2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

The components of the actual nongravitational acceleration affecting the orbital motion of C/1973 D1 must satisfy these conditions in order not to worsen the distribution of residuals beyond the acceptable levels in right ascension and declination as defined above.[8]

[8] In addition, the limit on the normal component is supported by an orbital solution that incorporated A_3 as a variable and resulted in $A_3 = (+0.22 \pm 0.18) \times 10^{-8}\ \mathrm{AU\ day^{-2}}$.

Table 4
Orbital Elements of Comets C/1846 O1 (de Vico-Hind) and C/1973 D1 (Kohoutek) (Equinox J2000.0)

Orbital Element/Quantity	Comet C/1846 O1	Comet C/1973 D1
Osculation epoch (TT)	1846 May 24.0	1973 June 7.0
Time of perihelion passage t_π (TT)	1846 May 26.9812 ± 0.150	1973 June 7.18065 ± 0.00033
Argument of perihelion ω	$77°.4489 \pm 0°.140$	$74°.85939 \pm 0°.00020$
Longitude of ascending node Ω	$163°.6715 \pm 0°.023$	$164°.81774 \pm 0°.00004$
Orbit inclination i	$122°.1140 \pm 0°.029$	$121°.59827 \pm 0°.00008$
Perihelion distance q (AU)	1.35469 ± 0.0022	1.3820157 ± 0.0000023
Orbital eccentricity e	0.97862 ± 0.0023	0.9987040 ± 0.0000104
Orbital period P (yr) osculation	504 ± 83	$34\,820 \pm 420$
Orbital period P (yr) original[a]	490	16 300
Longitude of perihelion L_π	$98°.395 \pm 0°.28$	$102°.1298 \pm 0°.0004$
Latitude of perihelion B_π	$+55°.766 \pm 0°.05$	$+55°.3033 \pm 0°.0001$
Orbital arc covered by observations	1846 July 30–1846 Sept 25	1973 Feb 28–1973 Sept 22
Period of time covered (days)	57	209
Number of observations employed	11	31
Root-mean-squares residual	$\pm 2''.8$	$\pm 0''.76$
Orbit-quality code[b]	2B	1B

Notes.

[a] Referred to the barycenter of the Solar System; perihelion time of C/1846 O1 in previous return to the Sun was nominally on 1356 March 23 TT, but its uncertain is a few centuries.

[b] Following the classification system introduced by Marsden et al. (1978).

3.4. *Orbital Properties of C/1846 O1 and C/1973 D1, and Their Implications*

Perfunctory inspection of Table 4 reveals immediately that C/1846 O1 and C/1973 D1 arrived at their perihelia at nearly the same time of the year; while this fact implies that their paths over the sky must have been rather similar (given that the other elements are also very much alike), this coincidence is from the standpoint of the two comets' potential relationship inconsequential.

Our orbital solution for C/1973 D1 in Table 4 confirms that the comet's previous return to perihelion occurred some 16 000 to 17 000 years ago. Even though the mean error in our solution is almost a factor of two lower than in Marsden et al.'s (1978) — ±420 yr vs ±750 yr — the difference in the nominal original orbital period is only 220 yr. On the other hand, the discrepancy between our and Vogel's (1868) sets of orbital elements for C/1846 O1 is quite significant, as already pointed out in Section 3.2. It should be noted that while the worrisome difference between C/1846 O1 and C/1973 D1 of 3°.9 in the argument of perihelion now dropped to merely 2°.6, the difference in the perihelion distance increased from 0.006 AU to 0.027 AU. The most striking finding in Table 4 is the orbital period for C/1846 O1. Although the quality of the set of elements for this comet is markedly inferior to that of C/1973 D1, it is extremely unlikely that the orbital period of C/1846 O1 exceeded ∼1600 yr regardless of the adopted rejection cutoff for the residuals, as is documented by Table 3. This upper limit on the orbital period is still one order of magnitude shorter than the original orbital period of C/1973 D1. The poorly determined nominal orbital period of C/1846 O1 in Table 4 is more than 30 times shorter than that of C/1973 D1.

Under these circumstances, a temporal gap of 127 yr between the two comets is inconsequential and the promisingly looking straightforward explanation of their genetic relationship, expounded in Section 3.1, is invali-

Table 5
Residuals from Orbital Solution for C/1846 O1 (Equinox J2000)

Time of Observation 1846 (UT)	Residual in R.A.	Residual in Decl.	Observer and Site
July 30.02930	(−29″.9)	(+25″.8)	de Vico (Rome)
30.04516	+4.1	−0.7	Hind (London)
30.05932	+3.9	−1.0	Hind (London)
30.93029	−3.8	+3.4	Mann (Greenwich)
30.93443	−4.9	−1.8	Mann (Greenwich)
30.93759	(+0.3)	(+11.9)	Mann (Greenwich)
30.94061	(−2.4)	(+13.6)	Mann (Greenwich)
30.97446	(+3.7)	(+83.1)	Hind (London)
Aug 5.05022	(−4.0)	(+18.5)	Rümker (Hamburg)
5.97099	−0.9	−0.3	Encke (Berlin)
12.90587	(+15.0)	(−0.3)	Argelander (Bonn)
14.88133	(+18.1)	(+5.7)	Schmidt (Bonn)
14.89354	(+18.8)	(+2.5)	Argelander (Bonn)
15.88556	(+16.7)	(+5.5)	Schmidt (Bonn)
16.87509	(+59.8)	(−79.3)	Schmidt (Bonn)
16.93257	−1.1	+1.4	Wichmann (Königsberg)
17.87077	(+29.9)	(−4.2)	Schmidt (Bonn)
23.91182	+0.8	−1.7	Wichmann (Königsberg)
24.92581	(−3.9)	(+35.0)	Argelander (Bonn)
24.92581	(+0.7)	(+34.2)	Argelander (Bonn)
25.89247	+3.5	+3.1	Wichmann (Königsberg)
28.89968	(+158.6)	(+68.0)	Schmidt (Bonn)
Sept 14.94446	−2.1	−4.3	Argelander (Bonn)
19.01074	(+28.7)	(+5.2)	Argelander (Bonn)
19.94649	(+21.1)	(+6.7)	Argelander (Bonn)
22.83162	(−5.7)	(+13.7)	Argelander (Bonn)
22.88378	(+15.4)	(+8.1)	Argelander (Bonn)
23.93870	(−4.8)	(−7.0)	Argelander (Bonn)
23.97465	+4.2	−0.7	Argelander (Bonn)
25.02630	(+6.4)	(+11.1)	Argelander (Bonn)
25.93333	−3.3	+3.2	Argelander (Bonn)
26.93418	(+23.2)	(+10.9)	Argelander (Bonn)

Table 6
Residuals from Orbital Solution for C/1973 D1 (Equinox J2000)

Time of Observation 1973 (UT)		Residual in R.A.	Residual in Decl.	Observer and Site
Feb	28.02535	+1″.2	−0″.3	Kohoutek (Hamburg-Bergedorf)
	28.05174	(−3.1)	(+3.3)	Kohoutek (Hamburg-Bergedorf)
Mar	3.65417	(−2.9)	(+0.9)	Kojima (Ishiki)
	6.65347	+1.2	−0.7	Seki (Kochi)
	7.66458	(+2.6)	(−1.9)	Seki (Kochi)
	7.72014	+0.5	−1.0	Kojima (Ishiki)
.	7.84688	−1.2	+1.3	Kohoutek (Hamburg-Bergedorf)
	7.85590	−1.8	+0.1	Kohoutek (Hamburg-Bergedorf)
	8.55938	(+2.7)	(−1.2)	Ike (Tosa)
	9.01569	−1.0	0.0	Milet (Nice)
	9.87431	+1.8	0.0	Kohoutek (Hamburg-Bergedorf)
	9.88403	(+2.9)	(−0.4)	Kohoutek (Hamburg-Bergedorf)
	10.63854	−0.3	−0.7	Kojima (Ishiki)
	10.69966	−1.2	+0.8	Kojima (Ishiki)
	21.83194	−0.7	−0.9	Kohoutek (Hamburg-Bergedorf)
	21.84097	−1.1	−0.2	Kohoutek (Hamburg-Bergedorf)
	22.84843	(+1.9)	(−2.9)	Wood (Woolston)
	23.91670	(+4.3)	(−4.2)	Petrovičová (Klet')
	26.17778	(+2.1)	(−3.5)	Giclas (Lowell)
	26.86042	+0.2	+0.9	Kohoutek (Hamburg-Bergedorf)
	27.84634	+0.1	+0.6	Mrkos (Klet')
	28.86120	−0.2	−0.8	Mrkos (Klet')
	28.86850	+0.6	+0.4	Mrkos (Klet')
	30.84681	(+2.1)	(+1.3)	Mrkos (Klet')
Apr	3.84444	0.0	−0.2	Kohoutek (Hamburg-Bergedorf)
	3.85278	+1.1	0.0	Kohoutek (Hamburg-Bergedorf)
	4.93568	(+3.5)	(−3.5)	Mrkos (Klet')
	4.94326	(+3.3)	(+0.4)	Mrkos (Klet')
	6.89644	+0.1	+1.0	Hendrie (Woolston)
	19.83802	−0.9	−0.2	Kohoutek (Hamburg-Bergedorf)
	19.84583	+0.3	−0.8	Kohoutek (Hamburg-Bergedorf)
	26.13542	−0.1	+1.3	Roemer (Kitt Peak)
	26.14248	0.0	+1.1	Roemer (Kitt Peak)
	26.87431	+1.3	+0.2	Kohoutek (Hamburg-Bergedorf)
May	1.04521	+0.3	+0.1	McCrosky et al. (Agassiz Station)
	28.94549	+0.8	0.0	Kohoutek (Hamburg-Bergedorf)
Aug	1.04074	−0.8	−0.5	Kohoutek (Hamburg-Bergedorf)
	27.06314	+0.3	+0.1	Kohoutek (Hamburg-Bergedorf)
Sept	21.18299	+1.0	+0.6	Roemer (Kitt Peak)
	21.19306	+0.6	−0.1	Roemer (Kitt Peak)
	22.91441	−0.4	−0.4	Kohoutek (Hamburg-Bergedorf)
	22.93872	−0.8	−0.3	Kohoutek (Hamburg-Bergedorf)



Figure 2. Schematic representation of the orbital orientations of comet C/1973 D1 and Jupiter to assess effects of the planet's gravity pull on the comet. We depict the Sun (S), the comet's perihelion point (Π), the nodal line with the positions of the ascending node (Ω) and the descending node (℧), and two pairs of relative positions of the comet and Jupiter. When the comet is at C_1 and Jupiter at J_1, the planet's gravity pulls the comet in the general direction against its motion, thus decreasing its orbital velocity and period, whereas when the comet is at C_2 and Jupiter at J_2, the planet's gravity pulls the comet in the general direction of its motion, increasing its orbital velocity and period. Since the Jovicentric distance in the relative positions of type 1 is typically smaller than in the relative positions of type 2, the braking effect of the planet's pull is usually stronger.

dated, as it is trivial to show that the effects of splitting cannot alone insert fragments into orbits as different as to have the orbital periods of, respectively, 500 yr and 16 300 yr. Indeed, a differential velocity along the orbital-velocity vector at perihelion 1.38 AU from the Sun (the only part of the parent's orbit presumably shared by such fragments before splitting) comes out in this case to be about 180 m s^{-1} and it would not drop below 70 m s^{-1} even in an extreme case of C/1846 O1's orbital period of 1600 yr. Since, in addition, a statistically averaged *total* separation velocity is π times higher than its orbital-velocity component (Section 2.2.1 of Paper 1), the typical separation velocities implied, some 220–560 m s^{-1}, are fully two to three orders of magnitude higher than the known separation velocities of the split comets (which are submeter- to meter-per-second; e.g., Sekanina 1982). Accordingly, C/1846 O1 and C/1973 D1 must already have been separate objects in the previous return to perihelion 16 000–17 000 years ago, and if they are fragments of a common parent comet at all, it must have broken up substantially earlier than in the course of the previous return to perihelion — invoking the fragmentation category C in Section 3.1.

Another noteworthy property of the two orbits in Table 4, especially of the orbit of C/1973 D1, is the position of the line of nodes. The comet's passage through its ascending node 122 days before perihelion at a heliocentric distance of 2.19 AU is of no particular interest, but the passage through its descending node 274 days after perihelion at a heliocentric distance of 3.74 AU is significant because the comet is then not too far from the Jovian orbit, whose heliocentric distance at that longitude is 4.98 AU. Close encounters of the comet with the planet, down to ∼0.6 AU, are in fact possible especially around 100 days past the passage through the descending node, when the comet is south of the planet's orbit plane and moving away from it. If the planet is in that part of its orbit at the time, its gravity is pulling the comet in the direction opposite the motion into an orbit of shorter period, as schematically depicted in Figure 2 (a configuration J_1–C_1). The Jovian gravity can also pull the comet into an orbit of longer period (a configuration J_2–C_2), but the magnitude of such an effect is generally smaller because of a larger Jovicentric distance of the comet.

The uncertainties in the orbital motions of C/1846 O1 and C/1973 D1, especially in their orbital periods, prevent us from investigating any particular scenario of a potential genetic relationship between the two comets. Instead, we examine whether *such a relationship could in principle be possible*.

The orbit of C/1973 D1 in Table 4 is suitable as a starting point to undertake this task because it is of adequate quality for this purpose and supplies credible evidence that the potential fragmentation did not occur more recently than 16 000–17 000 years ago. This conclusion is independent of the fact that, if related, C/1973 D1 would be a companion to C/1846 O1. In addition, the tight limits on the magnitude of the nongravitational acceleration in the orbital motion of C/1973 D1 [relations (2)] rule out its major effect on the results; accordingly, we will be working with the gravitational orbit in Table 4.

3.5. *Integration of Motion of C/1973 D1 to Previous Perihelion and Encounter with Jupiter*

The next step in our investigation was the integration of the motion of C/1973 D1 back in time to the previous passage through perihelion, employing an extended version of the standard JPL DE421 ephemeris. Since we dealt with time intervals of up to ∼20 000 years, we first conducted thorough tests of truncation errors by comparing results of integration to 15 decimal places with those to 17 decimal places — the actual precision employed in our computations. In the absence of close encounters with Jupiter the truncation errors remained in a subsecond range over the entire period of time. In the presence of four encounters, the differences between the two precision limits amounted to about 2 seconds after integration over 10 000 yr, 30 minutes after 15 000 yr, and 1.5 days after 20 000 yr, so the precision to 17 decimal places assured us that errors did not exceed 0.02 second after 10 000 yr, 20 seconds after 15 000 yr, and 1300 seconds after 20 000 yr. We were confident that truncation should not affect our results appreciably, except when at least four encounters and integration over ∼20 millennia were involved; we return to this issue in Section 6.

The reciprocal original semimajor axis of C/1973 D1 derived from the orbital elements in Table 4 comes out to be $+0.0015555 \pm 0.0000072$ (AU)$^{-1}$. Direct integration of the nominal orbit from 1973 back in time resulted in a perihelion time of April 18 of the year −14 321 or 14 322 BCE. Since perihelion was also the osculation epoch of the orbital set, the solution includes the post-perihelion planetary perturbations of the comet's motion in that return. The comet did not get closer to Jupiter than 4.556 AU (10 days after perihelion). Because the mean error in the orbital period is ±420 yr, the probability that the nominal case represents the real situation is very close to zero, which justifies the search for a range of plausible solutions, primarily those that involve an encounter with Jupter (Section 3.4).

We addressed this issue by varying slightly the 1973 orbit eccentricity of C/1973 D1 and by examining the changing circumstances during the comet's previous return to perihelion, including its motion relative to Jupiter. We discovered that the most significant orbital changes occurred in a range of adopted eccentricities from $e_{\rm nominal} + 0.00000028$ to $e_{\rm nominal} + 0.00000042$, which differ from the nominal value by 2.7% to 4% of its mean error and are perfectly tolerable deviations. The major results, presented in Figure 3, include three orbital elements with the planetary perturbations integrated down to perihelion — the argument of perihelion ω, the perihelion distance q, and the reciprocal semimajor axis $1/a$ (all at the osculation epoch of perihelion) — and two Jovian-encounter parameters — the time of closest approach reckoned from the comet's perihelion time, $\Delta t_\pi^{\rm J}$, and the minimum distance from the planet, $\Delta_{\rm J}$. They are plotted against the comet's perihelion time, which ranges from −14 326 June 1 to −14 324 April 1, thus covering a period of 22 months.



Figure 3. Plot, against the varied perihelion time of C/1973 D1 in its previous return 16 300 yr ago, of the comet's perturbed orbital elements and Jovian-encounter parameters, from the top down: the argument of perihelion ω; the perihelion distance q; the encounter time, measured as a temporal distance of closest approach to Jupiter from the comet's perihelion time, $\Delta t_\pi^{\rm J}$; the miss distance at the time of closest approach, $\Delta_{\rm J}$; and the reciprocal semimajor axis, $1/a$. The osculating $1/a$ at the 1973 perihelion and the original $(1/a)_{\rm orig}$ are also shown. The uncertainty in the perihelion time is ±420 yr, but, given its choice, the errors in the plotted quantities are smaller than the size of the symbols. The quantities ω, $\Delta t_\pi^{\rm J}$, and $1/a$ have their scales on the left, q and $\Delta_{\rm J}$ on the right. Note that year 1 is −14 325 and that the Julian dates are negative by more than 3.5 million days.

Inspecting three of the curves in Figure 3 — those for $1/a$, $\Delta t_\pi^{\rm J}$, and $\Delta_{\rm J}$, we note the prominent variations in $1/a$ that show two distinct extremes referring to the perihelion times 264 days, or nearly 9 months, apart. A $1/a$ maximum of $+0.002095$ $(\mathrm{AU})^{-1}$ that occurs 341 days after perihelion at a minimum Jovicentric distance of 0.874 AU refers to a perihelion time of −14 325 June 27, whereas a $1/a$ minimum of $+0.000049$ $(\mathrm{AU})^{-1}$ that takes place 440 days after perihelion at a minimum Jovicentric distance of 1.036 AU refers to a perihelion time of −14 326 October 6.[9] The comet's motion was integrated back in time; when reckoning the $1/a$ variations in the forward direction, the $1/a$ maximum refers to the case of a peak acceleration of the comet's orbital motion (a maximum increase in the orbital period), while the $1/a$ minimum to that of a peak deceleration (a maximum decrease in the orbital period). We may perceive the two extremes as belonging to two hypothetical objects, H_1 and H_2, and formulate our findings as follows:

(1a) A hypothetical object H_1, moving in the post-encounter orbit of comet C/1973 D1 and having closest approach to Jupiter 341 days after perihelion (which took place on −14 325 June 27), had at perihelion a pre-encounter $1/a = +0.002095$ $(\mathrm{AU})^{-1}$.

(1b) A hypothetical object H_2, moving in the post-encounter orbit of comet C/1973 D1 with closest approach to Jupiter 440 days after perihelion (occurring on −14 326 October 6), had at perihelion a pre-encounter $1/a = +0.000049$ $(\mathrm{AU})^{-1}$. Thus, H_2 passed through its perihelion 264 days earlier than H_1 and reached the point of closest approach to Jupiter $264+341-440=165$ days earlier than H_1. Before the encounters, H_2 was moving ahead of H_1 in an orbit that was very similar to, but slightly more elongated than, the orbit of H_1. The difference between the two objects in the pre-encounter value of $1/a$ equals $+0.002095-0.000049=+0.002046$ $(\mathrm{AU})^{-1}$ near perihelion, in the sense H_1-H_2.

Next we propose a scenario:

(2a) Let object H_1 be identical with comet C/1973 D1; its pre-encounter $1/a=+0.002095$ $(\mathrm{AU})^{-1}$ at perihelion, whereas its post-encounter $1/a$ far from the Sun became eventually equal to $(1/a)_{\rm fut} = +0.0015555$ $(\mathrm{AU})^{-1}$.

(2b) Let a third object, H_3, have its Jovian encounter at the same time as H_2, but before the encounter it was moving in the orbit of H_1 rather than H_2.

(2c) Let object H_3 be identical with comet C/1846 O1, so that both comets were moving along the same pre-encounter orbit.

(2d) Let the gap of 264 days between C/1846 O1 and C/1973 D1 be a product of their parent's fragmentation some time before they reached perihelion in the course of the 15th millennium BCE.

This scenario allows us to arrive at the following three conclusions:

(3a) Near perihelion, the pre-encounter $1/a$ of both C/1846 O1 and C/1973 D1 equaled $+0.002095$ $(\mathrm{AU})^{-1}$ and their orbital period ∼10 400 yr.[10] Far from the Sun on the way to perihelion the comets' orbital period was equal to ∼7160 yr. The leading position of C/1846 O1 suggests that it was the primary fragment, C/1973 D1 was the companion (cf. the comet groups in Paper 1).

(3b) The post-encounter $1/a$ of comet C/1846 O1 was greater than $1/a$ of comet C/1973 D1 by an amount approximately equal to 0.002046 $(\mathrm{AU})^{-1}$, the difference between the pre-encounter $1/a$ values of $+0.000049$ $(\mathrm{AU})^{-1}$ and $+0.002095$ $(\mathrm{AU})^{-1}$. Since the post-encounter $1/a$ of C/1973 D1 eventually equaled $+0.0015555$ $(\mathrm{AU})^{-1}$ (with the orbital period of 16 300 yr), it follows that the post-encounter $1/a$ of C/1846 O1 should have amounted to about $+0.001556 + 0.002046 \simeq +0.0036$ $(\mathrm{AU})^{-1}$ and its orbital period to a little less than 5000 yr.

(3c) Accordingly, the motions of the two comets were perturbed during their Jovian encounters very unevenly, as their times of closest approach differed by 165 days, a gap that was the product of their increasing separation following the parent's earlier fragmentation event. And while the motion of C/1973 D1 was accelerated by the perturbations into an orbit with a period of ∼16 300 yr, the motion of C/1846 O1 was slowed down so profoundly that this comet ended up in an orbit whose period was shorter by a factor of more than 3.

Although the contrast between the orbital periods of the two fragments is rather astonishing, there are two problems that still remain to be settled. One is the conditions at the time of the parent's fragmentation needed to explain the 264-day gap between the two comets, and the second is the process of shortening the orbital period of C/1846 O1 from the nearly 5000 yr down to ∼1000 yr or less to make the scenario consistent with the range of periods derived from the observations (Tables 3 and 4).

3.6. *Fragmentation Parameters for the Pair of C/1846 O1 and C/1973 D1*

A solution to the first of the two issues is straightforward, because there exists a precedent: the pair of long-period comets C/1988 F1 and C/1988 J1 was shown in Paper 1 to split off from the parent comet, which was on its way to perihelion, hundreds of AU from the Sun. An assumed separation velocity of about 1 m s^{-1} in the radial direction was all that was needed to explain a gap of 76 days between the two comets, measured by the gap between their times of perihelion passage.

The most probable heliocentric distance of the birth of C/1988 F1 and C/1988 J1 was ∼400 AU after aphelion, which is equivalent to a time of nearly 700 yr before the next perihelion.[11] Given that the orbital period of the 1988 comets was just about 14 000 yr (Paper 1), timewise the event took place about 10 times closer to perihelion than aphelion.

Because the required post-fragmentation gap of 264 days between the modeled perihelion times of C/1846 O1 and C/1973 D1 was nearly 3.5 times wider and because

[9] Closest approach possble, at a minimum Jovicentric distance of 0.649 AU at 379 days after perihelion and referring to a perihelion time of −14 325 March 6, essentially coincides with an inflection point of the $1/a$ curve in Figure 3.

[10] Here we neglect a slight effect on $1/a$ due to the separation velocity of C/1846 O1 and C/1973 D1, a product of their parent's fragmentation; its magnitude is estimated at ∼0.000001 $(\mathrm{AU})^{-1}$.

[11] The equations that determine the effect of the fragmentation time and the separation velocity on the perihelion times of the fragments were provided in Paper 1; they were now applied to C/1846 O1 and C/1973 D1 as well.

the comets were moving in an orbit with a period of 7160 yr far from the Sun, a separation velocity of 1 m s^{-1} in the radial direction — a representative value based on the arguments presented in Paper 1 — would require the fragmentation event to have occurred ∼600 AU from the Sun some 1650 yr before perihelion. The perturbation effect by Jupiter on C/1846 O1 was found to increase by a fair amount after we introduced, in addition, a normal component of the separation velocity of 0.5 m s^{-1}, since the comet was brought a little closer to the planet at the critical time. The normal component could not be increased any further in order to keep the velocity's magnitude from exceeding ∼1 m s^{-1} by a wide margin. The details of this phase of our work are in Section 4.

In subsequent runs we tested the dependence of the results on the location of the fragmentation event in the orbit, at earlier times. As the required radial component of the separation velocity was then lower, we could increase the normal component beyond 0.5 m s^{-1} and further boost the Jovian perturbations on the comet without violating the total-velocity magnitude constraint. For example, moving the fragmentation event to 700 AU from the Sun along the incoming leg of the parent's orbit, some 2500 yr before perihelion, required a separation velocity of about 0.4 m s^{-1} in the radial direction to accomodate the 264 days gap between C/1836 O1 and C/1973 D1 at perihelion in the 17th millennium BCE, thus allowing us to increase the velocity's normal component to at least 0.8 m s^{-1}. Timewise the event now took place closer to aphelion than to the next perihelion.

Similarly, we investigated a few additional scenarios, in which the fragmentation event was assumed to have taken place, respectively, at aphelion and at 700 AU and 500 AU from the Sun before aphelion. The radial component required to accommodate the 264-day gap was only a small fraction of 1 m s^{-1}, and the normal component could be increased up to 1 m s^{-1}. As a special case, we also considered a scenario with the fragmentation event having occurred shortly after the previous perihelion. The gap between the two comets at the next perihelion was now increased by exactly 8 Jupiter's orbital periods (to preserve the required geometry), allowed by a radial separation velocity slightly exceeding 1 m s^{-1}.

3.7. *Early Post-Fragmentation Motion of C/1846 O1*

Rigorous orbital computations confirmed both our conclusion (3b) in Section 3.5 concerning the post-encounter orbit of C/1846 O1 and the correlation between the orbital location of the fragmentation event and the radial component of the separation velocity. Consistent with expectation, all 264-day-gap solutions showed that the comet's initial post-fragmentation perihelion ought to have taken place in late September through October of −14 326 in order that the Jovian encounter in December of −14 325 could shorten the orbital period substantially.

In all scenarios that were run, the first post-encounter orbital period of C/1846 O1 was below 5000 yr, close to 400 Jovian sidereal periods, and more than a factor of two shorter than the post-fragmentation, pre-encounter orbital period of 10 400 yr at perihelion. This result is a corollary of the verified conclusion (3b) of Section 3.5. The first post-encounter orbital period correlated rather indistinctly with the normal component of the separation velocity, a higher velocity leading generally to a slightly shorter period. The length of the period did vary to a degree with the orbital location of the fragmentation event, the shortest period taking place when it occurred near but prior to the aphelion passage. This completes the description of the early post-fragmentation evolution of the modeled motion of C/1846 O1.

3.8. *Stochastic and Encounter-Dominated Perturbations. Diffusion of Comets*

Consider a comet in an elliptical orbit and unaffected by nongravitational forces. Let it pass its "initial", reference perihelion at time t_0 and let its first return to perihelion occur at time t_1, so that the anomalistic orbital period (in yr),[12] which includes effects of the planetary perturbations integrated over an inteval of time from t_0 to t_1, be $P_{0,1} = t_1 - t_0$. An effective semimajor axis (in AU) over this time span is $a_{0,1} = P_{0,1}^{2/3}$. Let, further, $z_{0,1}$ be the reciprocal value of $a_{0,1}$, so that $P_{0,1} = z_{0,1}^{-3/2}$. At t_1 the comet begins a new revolution about the Sun, during which it is subjected to the planetary perturbations, whose integrated effect on the reciprocal semimajor axis is $\Delta z_{1,2}$. This revolution terminates at time t_2 of the next return to perihelion. The effective semimajor axis during this revolution is $z_{1,2} = z_{0,1} + \Delta z_{1,2}$. Similarly, let $\Delta z_{2,3}$ be an integrated effect of the planetary perturbations between the perihelion passages at t_2 and t_3, so that $z_{2,3} = z_{1,2} + \Delta z_{2,3}$, etc. For a sequence of perihelion times, t_i $(i = 1, \ldots, n)$, we can write progressively

$$
\begin{aligned}
t_1 &= t_0 + z_{0,1}^{-\frac{3}{2}}, \\
t_2 &= t_0 + z_{0,1}^{-\frac{3}{2}} \left[1 + \left(1 + \frac{\Delta z_{1,2}}{z_{0,1}} \right)^{-\frac{3}{2}} \right], \\
t_3 &= t_0 + z_{0,1}^{-\frac{3}{2}} \left[1 + \left(1 + \frac{\Delta z_{1,2}}{z_{0,1}} \right)^{-\frac{3}{2}} + \left(1 + \frac{\Delta z_{1,2}}{z_{0,1}} + \frac{\Delta z_{2,3}}{z_{0,1}} \right)^{-\frac{3}{2}} \right], \\
&\ldots\ldots\ldots



Figure 4. Planetary perturbations of the reciprocal semimajor axis of C/1973 D1, $\Delta(1/a) = \Delta z$, integrated over one revolution about the Sun and plotted as a function of the perihelion time in the previous return in the 15th millennium BCE. The thick curve is a difference in $1/a$ between the "future" orbit and the "original" orbit at that return in the barycentric system of coordinates; the thinner curve is a difference between the $1/a$ osculation values at perihelion in 1973 and at the previous return in the heliocentric system of coordinates. In the former case $\Delta(1/a) = 0$ marks the future orbit, which is equal to the original orbit relative to the 1973 return, amounting to +0.0015555 $(\text{AU})^{-1}$. In the latter case $\Delta(1/a) = 0$ refers to the osculating $1/a$ at the 1973 perihelion, +0.0009378 $(\text{AU})^{-1}$, and indicates that the orbital period for the corresponding perihelion time in the 15th millennium BCE was 16 300 yr.

comets and with the hypotheses of comet origin. Following a pioneering work by van Woerkom (1948), an enormous progress was recently achieved in the understanding of the diffusion process of objects from the Oort Cloud, Kuiper Belt, and Scattered Disk by applying powerful Monte Carlo numerical-simulation techniques and methods of long-term numerical integration. Most of these advances were summarized and reviewed by Dones et al. (2004), Morbidelli & Brown (2004), Duncan et al. (2004), Rickman (2004), and others.

Figure 4 displays the planetary perturbations of the reciprocal semimajor axis, integrated over one revolution about the Sun, as a function of the perihelion time, t_π, of C/1973 D1 at its previous return in the 15th millennium BCE; both the standard difference between the barycentric "future" and "original" orbits (thick curve) and the difference between the heliocentric osculating values at perihelion in 1973 and at the previous return (thin curve) are presented. The two curves have somewhat similar features, but are by no means alike. The most remarkable feature is in a relatively narrow range of perihelion times centered on −4.12 yr, which allows the comet to have the closest possible approach to Jupiter, to 0.649 AU. In this range of t_π the two curves copy each other very closely, the only perceptible difference being in the amplitude: 0.002046 $(\text{AU})^{-1}$ in the heliocentric system, but 0.001969 $(\text{AU})^{-1}$ in the barycentric system.

Figure 4 further shows that, statistically, the pattern of perturbations, dominated by the encounter with Jupiter, slightly favors outward diffusion, toward larger orbits and longer orbital periods. This tendency is numerically demonstrated by computing an integrated perturbation, $(1/a)_{\text{future}} - (1/a)_{\text{original}}$, averaged over the Jovian orbital period, P_{J}:

$$\langle \Delta(1/a)_{\text{orig,fut}} \rangle = \langle \Delta z \rangle = \frac{1}{P_{\text{J}}} \int_{t_{\text{beg}}}^{t_{\text{beg}}+P_{\text{J}}} \Delta z(t_\pi)\, dt_\pi, \quad (4)$$

where t_{beg} is a chosen integration start time. Integrating over the thick curve in Figure 4, we find that $\langle \Delta z \rangle = -0.0000334\ (\text{AU})^{-1}$.

Our scenario for C/1846 O1, charted in Section 3.5, is statistically atypical. To estimate a probability and magntidue time scale over which C/1846 O1 would under random diffusion conditions evolve from its initial post-encounter orbit into an orbit of a much shorter period, comparable to the orbit observed in 1846, we integrated the portion of the thick curve in Figure 4 over which $\Delta z(t_\pi) > 0$ to find $\langle \Delta z^* \rangle = +0.000322\ (\text{AU})^{-1}$. The range of these perihelion times equals 5.4862 yr or 0.463 the Jovian orbital period. Thus, the probability of a comet in the orbit of C/1973 D1 having its period shortened during one perihelion passage is 0.463; after n returns, the probability is 0.463^n. To estimate n, we recall from Section 3.5 that at the first return to perihelion $z_{0,1} = z_{\text{init}} \simeq +0.0036\ (\text{AU})^{-1}$ and replace $\Delta z_{i,i+1}$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots)$ in Equations (3) with $\langle \Delta z^* \rangle$ to simplify the expression; for $n \geq 2$ we obtain:

$$t_n = t_0 + P_{\text{init}} \left[1 + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \left(1 + k\, \frac{\langle \Delta z^* \rangle}{z_{\text{init}}} \right)^{-\frac{3}{2}} \right]$$

$$= t_0 + P_{\text{init}} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left(1 + k\, \frac{\langle \Delta z^* \rangle}{z_{\text{init}}} \right)^{-\frac{3}{2}}, \quad (5)$$

where $P_{\rm init} = P_{0,1} = t_1 - t_0 = z_{\rm init}^{\frac{3}{2}} \approx 4630$ yr. According to Figure 3, the proposed scenario requires the initial perihelion time, t_0, in late September through October of the year −14 326. The time scale, over which the comet's orbital period should get reduced below a required limit, $P_{\rm lim}$, equals the interval $t_n - t_0$. The final orbital period in 1846, $P_{\rm fin} = P_{n-1,n}$, is related to the initial period by

$$P_{\rm fin} = P_{\rm init} \left[1 + (n-1) \, \frac{\langle \Delta z^* \rangle}{z_{\rm init}} \right]^{-\frac{3}{2}}, \qquad (6)$$

and since $P_{\rm fin} < P_{\rm lim}$,

$$n > 1 + \frac{z_{\rm init}}{\langle \Delta z^* \rangle} \left[\left(\frac{P_{\rm init}}{P_{\rm lim}} \right)^{\frac{2}{3}} - 1 \right]. \qquad (7)$$

Requiring, for example, that $P_{\rm lim} \approx 1000$ yr, the above values of $\langle \Delta z^* \rangle$, $z_{\rm init}$, and $P_{\rm init}$ imply that $n > 20$. With $n = 21$ the time scale $t_n - t_0 = 9.59 \, P_{\rm init} \simeq 44\,400$ yr, nearly three times longer than the case of a genetical relationship would require for C/1846 O1. The probability of this systematic reduction of the orbital period to happen under random diffusion conditions is $0.463^{21} \simeq 10^{-7}$. One could use Figure 4 to come up with other similar scenarios with even lower probability.

It is invariably assumed that the diffusion process is governed by the Gaussian law. Zhou et al. (2002) pointed out, however, that the Gaussian approximation is appropriate only for small perturbations of $1/a$ accumulating over a number of revolutions. When an average perturbation per revolution is not small in comparison with the final change in $1/a$, Zhou et al. proposed that the orbital evolution is governed by the Lévy (1937) random walk because of a disproportionately large contribution by the significant perturbation events due to close approaches to Jupiter. The Lévy walk appears to better fit enhanced (or anomalous) diffusion and has a number of applications in physics (e.g., Shlesinger et al. 1987).

The paradigm of random walk, applicable to a statistical sample, has no prognosticative merit in an individual case. In fact, the best known triggers of dramatically enhanced rates of diffusion in the orbital evolution of comets are the occasional very close encounters with Jupiter ($\Delta_{\rm J} < 0.1$ AU), during which an orbit can be transformed beyond a shade of recognition. They happen in spite of their extremely low *a priori* probabilities of occurrence. An example is C/1770 L1 (Lexell), observed at a single apparition as a short-period comet with a period of 5.60 yr and approaching the Earth to a record minimum distance of 0.0151 AU on 1770 July 1 (Sekanina & Yeomans 1984). The comet's orbital history was investigated more than once (e.g., Lexell 1778; Le Verrier 1857; Callandreau 1892; Kazimirchak-Polonskaya 1967, 1972; Carusi et al. 1985). There is a general consensus that the comet had very close encounters with Jupiter shortly before discovery and again a dozen years later. The results of the computations by Kazimirchak-Polonskaya (1967) show that the first encounter took place in March 1767 ($\Delta_{\rm J} = 0.020$ AU) and the second one in July 1779 ($\Delta_{\rm J} = 0.0015$ AU). The total perturbation effect of the first event was about $\Delta z = +0.106$ $(\mathrm{AU})^{-1}$, of the second event at least $\Delta z = -0.32$ $(\mathrm{AU})^{-1}$. These energy jumps are two orders of magnitude greater than the peak integrated perturbation effect for C/1973 D1 in Figure 4.

3.9. *High-Order Orbital-Cascade Resonance*

Isolated close encounters with Jupiter, ruled out in the case of C/1846 O1, are not the only means to distinctly disrupt a comet's evolution of slow, random orbital diffusion. Another well-known example of a strongly nonradom pattern of cometary motions is orbital (mean-motion) resonance, defined classically as a periodic gravitational influence of a perturbing planet (usually Jupiter) due to the two bodies' orbital periods having a ratio of two small integers. The result can be either a destabilization of the comet's orbit or a pattern of a recurring configuration (libration) over a certain period of time, depending on whether relatively close encounters keep occurring or are systematically avoided and on how close to being perfect the resonance is.

We already pointed out in Section 3.7 that in our early computer runs the initial post-fragmentation orbital period for C/1846 O1 — near 400 Jovian sidereal periods following the comet's approach to the planet some 440 days after perihelion (for details, see Section 4) — was followed by a still shorter period by the next return. Since this particular timing of the encounter was instrumental in a significant reduction of the orbital period, a repetitive, long-term trend of this kind should warrant a scenario in which the comet kept encountering Jupiter ∼440 days after perihelion at as many consecutive returns as possible. And since, on the other hand, a continuing recurrence of this configuration required that the comet's perihelion passages followed each other after an integral number of Jovian revolutions about the Sun, this replicate mean-motion commensurability — capable to systematically reduce the orbital period of C/1846 O1 quite dramatically over a relatively short period of time — locked the comet's motion temporarily in what we refer to as a *high-order orbital-cascade resonance* with Jupiter's orbital motion. An *a priori* probability of this lock is low, but so is the probability of close encounters with Jupiter (Sec. 6).

The term high-order orbital-cascade resonance requires an explanation, because two fundamental properties of orbital resonance, as usually understood in celestial mechanics, are missing. One, the comet's and Jovian orbital periods are *not* related by a ratio of two *small* integers (whence *high-order*) and the integers decrease from return to next return; and, two, the result of the resonance is neither a stabilization (libration) nor a destabilization of the orbit, but its period's rapid and profound shortening that proceeds in successive discrete steps (whence *cascade*) over a span of time that is only a factor of two or so longer than the pre-fragmentation orbital period.

The repetition, from return to next return, of nearly identical encounter geometry is demanded in order to preserve a recurrence of nearly constant integrated perturbations, $\Delta z_{\rm res}$. Athough our reason is now different, we nonetheless require a formal modification of Equations (3) that is the same as in Equations (5),

$$t_n = t_0 + P_{\rm init} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left(1 + k \, \frac{\Delta z_{\rm res}}{z_{\rm init}} \right)^{-\frac{3}{2}}, \qquad (8)$$

except that we solve this equation for $\Delta z_{\rm res}$ rather than for n and, consequently, there are multiple solutions that depend on the choice of n. In addition, since we

try to fit the initial conditions related to the arrival of C/1846 O1, t_n is the comet's observed perihelion time, $t_n = 1846.40$, and therefore a constraint rather than an unknown. Equation (8) has no solution for $n < n_0$, where n_0 is a minimum number of returns needed in order that $\Delta z_{\rm res} > 0$. Introduction of another condition, $P_{\rm fin} < P_{\rm lim}$ (analogous to that used in Section 3.8), may restrict the number of returns more severely, to $n > n_{\rm lim}$.

Calling $\Delta\zeta = \Delta z_{\rm res}/z_{\rm init}$ and isolating the known parameters t_0, t_n, and $P_{\rm init}$ on one side, we rewrite Equation (8) in terms of dimensionless quantities $\Re$, $\Delta\zeta$:

$$\Re = \frac{t_n - t_0}{P_{\rm init}} = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (1 + k\,\Delta\zeta)^{-\frac{3}{2}}, \qquad (9)$$

where $\Re$ is an allowed normalized orbit-evolution time. The solutions $\Delta\zeta = f(\Re, n)$ were derived by a method of successive approximations for a wide range of n, the number of returns to perihelion. First, however, we needed information from orbit-integration runs aimed at the evolutionary scenario proposed in Section 3.5.

4. EARLY ORBIT-INTEGRATION RUNS

In compliance with the proposed scenario, the set of elements for C/1973 D1 with a minimum osculating orbital period of 10 430 yr at perihelion, on −14 325 June 27, was chosen as the starting orbit (Table 7), whose formal errors are those in Table 4. Its choice, as a product of integration of the comet's 1973 orbit back in time with an extremely slight correction to the nominal value of the eccentricity, assures us that the 1973 orbit of C/1973 D1 should satisfy any fragmentation scenario, provided that the separation velocity is added to C/1846 O1. Since C/1973 D1 was a companion (Section 2), the presumed parent of C/1846 O1 and C/1973 D1 had been moving in an orbit of slightly shorter period than C/1973 D1 and required that a separation velocity of the primary be formally referred to the companion rather than the other way around, as is customary when determining the conditions at fragmentation.

Table 7

Adopted Orbital Elements of Comet C/1973 D1 (Kohoutek) in the 15th Millennium BCE (Equinox J2000.0)

Orbital Element/Quantity	Adopted Orbit
Osculation epoch (TT)	−14 325 June 27.0
Time of perihelion passage t_π (TT)	−14 325 June 27.9115
Argument of perihelion ω	75°.1867
Longitude of ascending node Ω	164°.7265
Orbit inclination i	121°.6432
Perihelion distance q (AU)	1.399973
Orbital eccentricity e	0.997067
Orbital period P (yr) osculation	10 430
Orbital period P (yr) original[a]	7160
Longitude of perihelion L_π	101°.4787
Latitude of perihelion B_π	+55°.3900
Encounter with Jupiter:	
Date (TT)	−14 324 June 2
Time from perihelion (days)	+341
Minimum Jovicentric distance (AU)	0.8743

Note.
[a] Referred to the barycenter of the Solar System.

In compliance with the proposed scenario, the next step was the choice of the fragmentation time that would assure C/1846 O1 to arrive at perihelion about 264 days before C/1973 D1, that is, around −14 326 October 6; and, more importantly, to accomplish a close approach to Jupiter 165 days before C/1973 D1, that is, on or around −14 325 December 20. In the early runs, we searched for a solution that would satisfy the premise of a separation velocity between C/1973 D1 and C/1846 O1 of 1 m s^{-1} in the radial direction (C/1846 O1 sunward), because this component has by far the most significant effect on the subsequent perihelion time. The first solution we tested was for a fragmentation event at a heliocentric distance of 569 AU, about 1470 yr before perihelion, that is, in approximately 15 800 BCE. This solution satisfied the perihelion-time constraint to within two weeks, but fitted the Jovian-encounter condition very well.

The results of integration are presented in the upper half of Table 8. While, as expected [cf. condition (3b) in Section 3.5], the comet returned to perihelion in less than 5000 yr, the successive orbital periods grew progressively longer, contrary to our expectation. This solution was obviously unacceptable.

Since Figure 2 shows that the semimajor axis is most perturbed outside the node (that is, when Jupiter is out of the comet's orbit plane), we considered it desirable to introduce, in addition, an out-of-plane component of the separation velocity. Rather arbitrarily, we chose 0.5 m s^{-1} and found that the direction above the plane is the one that decreases the encounter's miss distance. Integration of this solution — the small normal component of the separation velocity being the *only* difference — offered dramatically different results, as shown in the lower half of Table 8. While the effects on the initial perihelion time and the Jovian-encounter time are only 3 days and on the initial orbital period merely 27 yr (less than 0.6%), the times of the next return to perihelion already differed by ∼1500 yr, a major trend that continued. By the year 1073, the comet completed four revolutions about the Sun in the second orbit, but less than three revolutions when in the first orbit.

The enormous discrepancy in the orbital motion of the comet in the two tested orbits was caused not only by the slightly smaller encounter distance, but primarily by the fact that the encounter times in the first three passages were — contrary to the random-walk rule — always on the "correct" side of the node, ∼400 days or more after perihelion, which warranted that the integrated perturbation $\Delta(1/a)$ was positive, as Table 8 plainly indicates. Only in the fourth return the closest approach to Jupiter occurred less than 300 days after perihelion and the gradual shortening of the orbital period came to an end.

Another useful purpose served by this exercise was a determination of the magnitudes of the integrated perturbation of the semimajor axis in these scenarios. For the positive changes of $\Delta(1/a)$ Table 8 suggests a range of 0.0005 to 0.0006 (AU)$^{-1}$, which is close to an average (e.g., van Woerkom 1948; Šteins & Kronkalne 1964; Fernández & Gallardo 1994).

A practical impact of this result on our further investigation had to do with the solution to Equation (9), as the unknown $\Delta\zeta$ depends critically on an integrated perturbation of the reciprocal semimajor axis in the case of orbital-cascade resonance. In Figure 5 we plot the al-

Table 8

Comparison of Two Early Orbit-Integration Runs for C/1846 O1 to Show Effects of Normal Component of Separation Velocity

Distance from Sun at Fragmentation (AU)	Separation Velocity ($m\,s^{-1}$)		Time of Perihelion Passage, t_π (TT)	Anomalistic Orbital Period P (yr)	Orbital-Period Ratio, P/P_J	Reciprocal Semimajor Axis[a] $1/a$ (AU^{-1})	Integrated Perturbation $\Delta(1/a)$ (AU^{-1})	Encounter with Jupiter		
	radial	normal						Date of Closest Approach (TT)	Days from Perihelion	Distance Δ_J (AU)
569	−1.0	0.0	−14 326 Oct 18.35					−14 325 Dec 20	+428	0.9886
			−9531 Jan 18.37	4794.25	404.172	+0.003517		−9531 Aug 3	+197	2.8650
			−4159 Dec 11.37	5372.90	452.954	+0.003260	−0.000257	−4158 Aug 18	+250	2.0154
			2917 Aug 28.74	7075.71	596.507	+0.002713	−0.000547	2917 Mar 15	−135	3.0855
569	−1.0	+0.5	−14 326 Oct 15.45					−14 325 Dec 17	+428	0.9797
			−9558 Mar 26.82	4767.44	401.912	+0.003530		−9557 Nov 1	+585	2.9626
			−5654 Jan 19.93	3903.82	329.106	+0.004033	+0.000503	−5653 Feb 20	+397	0.7342
			−2521 Jan 10.45	3132.97	264.120	+0.004670	+0.000637	−2521 Sept 4	+237	2.1807
			1073 Sept 9.35	3594.66	303.043	+0.004261	−0.000409	1074 Mar 18	+190	2.8293

Note.

[a] Determined from the anomalistic orbital period, P, in column 5 as $P^{-\frac{2}{3}}$.

lowed normalized orbit-evolution time $\Re$ and the ratio $\Lambda = P_{\rm fin}/P_{\rm init}$ as a function of the normalized perturbation $\Delta\zeta$. To determine $\Re$, we use $t_n = 1846.40$ for any n and employ the constants from the second scenario in Table 8, $t_0 = -14\,325.21$ yr and $P_{\rm init} = 4767.44$ yr; we find $\Re = 16\,171.61/4767.44 = 3.392$, which gives us six different solutions for $n = 4, \ldots, 9$. We read the values of $\Delta\zeta$ on the axis of abscissae and compute the integrated resonance perturbation $\Delta z_{\rm res} = 0.00353\,\Delta\zeta$ $(\mathrm{AU})^{-1}$. We also read the ratio $\Lambda = P_{\rm fin}/P_{\rm init}$ on the right-hand side of the axis of ordinates and compute the final orbital period, $P_{\rm fin} = 4767.44\,\Lambda$ yr. The caption to Figure 5 describes the individual solutions in detail. The end result is that the final period $P_{\rm fin} < 1600$ yr allows only $n \geq 6$, whereas $\Delta z_{\rm res} < 0.0007$ $(\mathrm{AU})^{-1}$ (cf. Table 8) allows only $n = 4$ or 5; the two conditions are not satisfied simultaneously for any n.



Figure 5. Plot of an allowed normalized orbit-evolution time, $\Re$ (the curves that decrease from the upper left to the lower right, with the scale on the left), and the final orbital period as a fraction of the initial orbital period, $\Lambda = P_{\rm fin}/P_{\rm init}$ (the curves that increase from the lower left to the upper right, with the scale on the right), against a resonance perturbation of the reciprocal semimajor axis integrated over one revolution about the Sun in units of the initial reciprocal semimajor axis, $\Delta\zeta$. Keeping the number of revolutions about the Sun, n, to less than 10, the dotted lines show that, for $\Re = 3.392$, the allowed solutions (left scale) are $\Delta\zeta = 0.0934$, 0.1871, 0.2505, 0.2968, 0.3325, and 0.3609 for, respectively, $n = 4$, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9, which with $z_{\rm init} = 0.003530$ $(\mathrm{AU})^{-1}$ correspond to $\Delta z_{\rm res} = 0.00033$, 0.00066, 0.00088, 0.00105, 0.00117, and 0.00130 $(\mathrm{AU})^{-1}$. There are no solutions for $n < 4$. The solutions for $P_{\rm fin}/P_{\rm init}$ are 0.6906 with $n = 4$, 0.4326 with $n = 5$, 0.2958 with $n = 6$, 0.2156 with $n = 7$, 0.1648 with $n = 8$, and 0.1305 with $n = 9$. With $P_{\rm init} = 4767.44$ yr, the final orbital periods $P_{\rm fin}$ are, respectively, 3292 yr, 2062 yr, 1410 yr, 1028 yr, 786 yr, and 622 yr. A constraint of, for example, $P_{\rm fin} < 1600$ yr allows only n equal to 6, 7, 8 or 9. There are also constraints on $\Delta z_{\rm res}$ (see text).

At this point of our experimentation, the conclusion was that if C/1846 O1 and C/1973 D1 are genetically related, then, in the least, it is dynamically extremely unlikely in the presence of orbital-cascade resonance that a fragmentation event occurring at ∼569 AU before a perihelion passage in the 15th millennium BCE could "launch" C/1846 O1 into an orbit that should eventually (in the 19th century) have an orbital period much shorter than about 2000 yr. We show in Section 5 that, fortunately, the motion of C/1846 O1 could be subjected to greater integrated perturbations of the semimajor axis, if the fragmentation event took place earlier, nearer the aphelion of the parent orbit. That option has another significant advantage: it needs a lower radial component of the separation velocity to keep C/1846 O1 and C/1973 D1 apart at the required ∼264 days at perihelion. As a result, it is possible to increase the magnitude of the normal component and still hold the total separation velocity at a realistic level near 1 m s^{-1}.

In deriving the two solutions presented in Table 8, no attempt was made to bring the orbital periods closer to a commensurability with the orbital period of Jupiter. Yet, the second solution shows that, of the four periods listed, the best is commensurable within 0.043 and the worst within 0.120 the Jovian period. The same computer code that was used to generate Figure 5 was also employed to investigate the commensurability and thus the chances of high-order orbital-cascade resonance to more significantly affect the rate of the orbital-period's reduction, as was discussed in Section 3.9.

Table 9
Best Schematic Solutions for Rapid Inward Drifting of Aphelion Driven by High-Ratio Orbital Resonance

Return to Perihelion, k	Initial Orbital Resonance 1:398 $\Delta z_{\rm res} = +0.001659$ (AU)$^{-1}$ $\epsilon_4 = 0.0114$; $\epsilon_5 = 0.0203$				Initial Orbital Resonance 1:403 $\Delta z_{\rm res} = +0.001704$ (AU)$^{-1}$ $\epsilon_4 = 0.0237$; $\epsilon_5 = 0.0527$				Initial Orbital Resonance 1:374 $\Delta z_{\rm res} = +0.001540$ (AU)$^{-1}$ $\epsilon_4 = 0.0335$; $\epsilon_5 = 0.0368$			
	Perihelion Time (TT)	Orbital Period[a]	Resonance	Dev. $\delta_{k,k+1}$	Perihelion Time (TT)	Orbital Period[a]	Resonance	Dev. $\delta_{k,k+1}$	Perihelion Time (TT)	Orbital Period[a]	Resonance	Dev. $\delta_{k,k+1}$
0	−14 326/10/15.00	4721.04	1:398	0.000	−14 326/10/15.00	4780.35	1:403	0.000	−14 326/10/15.00	4436.35	1:374	0.000
1	−9605/10/28.21	2657.02	1:224	−0.004	−9545/02/18.18	2645.29	1:223	+0.007	−9889/02/19.97	2633.40	1:222	+0.004
2	−6948/11/02.82	1755.32	1:148	−0.021	−6900/06/03.54	1732.49	1:146	+0.055	−7256/07/13.60	1789.65	1:151	−0.126
3	−5192/02/26.94	1268.97	1:107	−0.021	−5168/11/29.28	1245.89	1:105	+0.033	−5466/03/09.73	1316.72	1:111	+0.004
4	−3923/02/17.28	972.01	1:82	−0.056	−3922/10/18.43	950.95	1:80	+0.169	−4150/11/25.96	1020.72	1:86	+0.050
5	−2951/02/22.50	775.17	1:65	+0.350	−2971/09/30.93	756.45	1:64	−0.229	−3129/08/14.58	821.10	1:69	+0.221
6	−2176/04/25.49	636.83	1:54	−0.313	−2214/03/12.70	620.26	1:52	+0.290	−2308/09/19.19	679.01	1:57	+0.243
7	−1539/02/23.25	535.25	1:45	+0.123	−1594/06/13.99	520.54	1:44	−0.117	−1629/09/22.62	573.65	1:48	+0.360
8	−1004/05/23.17	458.06	1:39	−0.384	−1074/12/26.19	444.94	1:38	−0.490	−1055/05/15.92	492.97	1:42	−0.441
9	−546/06/15.57	397.80	1:34	−0.464	−629/12/03.83	386.02	1:33	−0.457	−562/05/03.72	429.57	1:36	+0.215
10	−148/04/01.76	349.68	1:29	+0.479	−243/12/11.09	339.05	1:29	−0.417	−133/11/28.93	378.69	1:32	−0.075
11	201/12/05.85	310.53	1:26	+0.179	96/12/27.99	300.88	1:25	+0.365	246/08/08.02	337.12	1:28	+0.420
12	512/06/18.01	278.18	1:23	+0.452	397/11/15.18	269.38	1:23	−0.291	583/09/19.30	302.63	1:26	−0.487
13	790/08/24.67	251.09	1:21	+0.167	667/04/01.97	243.01	1:20	+0.487	886/05/06.54	273.64	1:23	+0.069
14	1041/09/24.83	228.12	1:19	+0.231	910/04/05.92	220.68	1:19	−0.396	1159/12/27.68	249.01	1:21	−0.008
15	1269/11/06.70	208.45	1:18	−0.427	1130/12/10.60	201.57	1:17	−0.007	1408/12/30.80	227.86	1:19	+0.209
16	1478/04/19.75	191.45	1:16	+0.140	1332/07/07.48	185.07	1:16	−0.398	1636/11/09.42	209.54	1:18	−0.335
17	1669/10/02.39	176.65	1:15	−0.108	1517/08/03.42	170.71	1:14	+0.391	1846/05/26.98			
18	1846/05/26.98				1688/04/17.40	158.11	1:13	+0.329				
19					1846/05/26.98							

Note.
[a] Strictly, this is an anomalistic orbital period; it is expressed in yr.

5. REFINED ORBIT-INTEGRATION RUNS

For a given heliocentric distance at fragmentation, the timing of the comet's subsequent arrival to perihelion could always be adjusted by slightly varying the separation velocity's radial component, so that the initial orbital period, $P_{\rm init}$, be minimized. A very minor additional adjustment would be needed to assure that the period $P_{\rm init}$ be, in addition, nearly perfectly commensurable with the Jovian period.

It was this experimentation that prompted us to investigate, by trial and error, the most consistent sequences of orbital periods as a function of the allowed orbital-evolution time, $\Re$, and the number of returns, n, with $\Re$ from Equation (9) now expressed in terms of the 1:$\Gamma_{0.1}$ commensurability of the initial orbital period, $P_{0,1} = P_{\rm init}$ with the Jovian period, $P_{\rm J}$:

$$P_{\rm init} = \Gamma_{0,1} P_{\rm J}. \tag{10}$$

where $\Gamma_{0,1}$ is an integer.

The nature of changes in the orbital period — especially in cases considered here, when a perturbation of the reciprocal semimajor axis integrated over a revolution about the Sun, $\Delta z_{\rm res}$, is essentially constant from orbit to orbit — is such that the period drops most substantially over the first several returns after the fragmentation event. These early returns are accordingly the primary target of our interest, so much so in fact that they are the only ones over which the orbital period needs to be locked in a temporary cascade resonance to make the period $P_{\rm fin}$ broadly consistent with the observations. The degree of solutions' compliance with such an evolution of the orbital period could be tested by the computer code via an averaged deviation of the first m periods from strict commensurablity:

$$\epsilon_m = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \min[\mathsf{mod}\langle \chi_{i-1,i}, 1\rangle; 1 - \mathsf{mod}\langle \chi_{i-1,i}, 1\rangle], \tag{11}$$

where

$$\chi_{i-1,i} = \frac{P_{i-1,i}}{P_{\rm J}}, \tag{12}$$

mod is the *modulo operation*'s remainder,[13] and m equals 4 or 5. We already said that the initial orbital period can always be made perfectly consistent with an appropriately chosen commensurability 1:$\Gamma_{0,1}$; the nearest commensurabilities of the successive orbital periods, 1:$\Gamma_{1,2}$, 1:$\Gamma_{2,3}$, etc., are

$$\Gamma_{i-1,i} = \chi_{i-1,i} - \mathsf{mod}\langle \chi_{i-1,i}, 1\rangle, \quad (i = 2, 3, \ldots), \tag{13}$$

when $\mathsf{mod}\langle \chi_{i-1,i}, 1\rangle < \frac{1}{2}$, but

$$\Gamma_{i-1,i} = 1 + \chi_{i-1,i} - \mathsf{mod}\langle \chi_{i-1,i}, 1\rangle, \quad (i = 2, 3, \ldots), \tag{14}$$

when $\mathsf{mod}\langle \chi_{i-1,i}, 1\rangle > \frac{1}{2}$. Their averaged deviation ϵ_m from strict cascade resonance is given by Equation (11).

For $370 \le \Gamma_{0,1} \le 430$, three among the orbital-period sequences that were found to be most consistent with cascade resonance (lowest values of ϵ_m) are presented in Table 9; their purpose was to guide us in our effort to come up with solutions that best mimicked the orbital

[13] Typically, the *modulo operation* is described symbolically as $\alpha \bmod k$ or $\alpha \ (\mathsf{mod}\ k)$, where α (here a floating-point quantity) is a dividend, integer k is a divisor, $\mathsf{mod}\langle \alpha, k\rangle$ is a remainder, and integer $Q = \alpha/k - \mathsf{mod}\langle \alpha, k\rangle$ is a quotient.

Table 10
Best Schematic Solutions for Rapid Inward Drifting of Aphelion Driven by High-Ratio Orbital Resonance for $\Delta z_{\rm res} < 0.0015$ $(\mathrm{AU})^{-1}$

Return to Perihelion, k	Initial Orbital Resonance 1:380 $\Delta z_{\rm res} = +0.001300$ $(\mathrm{AU})^{-1}$ $\epsilon_4 = 0.0377$; $\epsilon_5 = 0.0339$				Initial Orbital Resonance 1:391 $\Delta z_{\rm res} = +0.001274$ $(\mathrm{AU})^{-1}$ $\epsilon_4 = 0.0396$; $\epsilon_5 = 0.0338$				Initial Orbital Resonance 1:401 $\Delta z_{\rm res} = +0.001441$ $(\mathrm{AU})^{-1}$ $\epsilon_4 = 0.0430$; $\epsilon_5 = 0.0371$			
	Perihelion Time (TT)	Orbital Period[a]	Resonance	Dev. $\delta_{k,k+1}$	Perihelion Time (TT)	Orbital Period[a]	Resonance	Dev. $\delta_{k,k+1}$	Perihelion Time (TT)	Orbital Period[a]	Resonance	Dev. $\delta_{k,k+1}$
0	−14 326/10/15.00	4507.52	1:380	0.000	−14 326/10/15.00	4638.00	1:391	0.000	−14 326/10/15.00	4756.62	1:401	0.000
1	−9818/04/23.53	2858.31	1:241	−0.034	−9688/10/15.85	2942.39	1:248	+0.054	−9569/05/29.99	2848.51	1:240	+0.139
2	−6960/08/14.48	2016.38	1:170	−0.012	−6745/03/08.18	2076.24	1:175	+0.035	−6721/11/30.71	1945.22	1:164	−0.011
3	−4944/12/29.65	1519.55	1:128	+0.104	−4669/06/04.95	1564.95	1:132	−0.069	−4775/02/20.96	1435.55	1:121	+0.022
4	−3424/07/19.54	1197.83	1:101	−0.019	−3104/05/15.44	1233.76	1:104	+0.011	−3340/09/10.35	1115.18	1:94	+0.014
5	−2226/05/18.85	975.53	1:82	+0.240	−1870/02/18.65	1004.89	1:85	−0.284	−2225/11/16.33	898.47	1:76	−0.256
6	−1251/11/27.71	814.39	1:69	−0.344	−865/01/07.89	838.95	1:71	−0.273	−1326/05/06.92	743.86	1:63	−0.290
7	−436/04/16.99	693.19	1:58	+0.438	−27/12/22.05	714.14	1:60	+0.205	−582/03/17.96	629.02	1:53	+0.028
8	257/06/26.34	599.33	1:51	−0.474	688/02/12.27	617.48	1:52	+0.055	47/03/23.94	540.95	1:46	−0.396
9	856/10/25.74	524.90	1:44	+0.251	1305/08/05.16	540.81	1:46	−0.408	588/03/06.53	471.68	1:40	−0.236
10	1381/09/18.26	464.69	1:39	+0.175	1846/05/26.98				1059/11/10.78	416.02	1:35	+0.072
11	1846/05/26.98								1475/11/20.09	370.52	1:31	+0.236
12									1846/05/26.98			

Note.
[a] Strictly, this is an anomalistic orbital period; it is expressed in yr.

period of C/1846 O1, estimated from the observations. For each sequence the numbers in the column "Resonance" are derived from Equation (13) or (14), and the individual deviations from the exact resonance, in the last column, from

$$\delta_{k,k+1} = \chi_{k,k+1} - \Gamma_{k,k+1}, \quad (k = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1), \quad (15)$$

where it always holds that $\delta_{0,1} = 0$ because of the condition (10). We note that, by a fifth return to perihelion, the orbital period drops to near or below 1000 yr, in fair agreement with the period of C/1846 O1 derived from the observations in Section 3.2. Accordingly, in cases like these we do not need to have cascade resonance locked for longer than five returns to the Sun, with random walk variations from a sixth return on making little difference except for the condition of the perihelion date in 1846. Indeed, Table 9 shows that a presumed continuation of the pattern of systematic reduction after the fifth revolution would lead to an orbital period of 150–200 yr in 1846, far shorter than dictated by the observations.

It would seem that because of our interest in the conditions at only the several early returns to the Sun, the total number, n, of chosen returns is irrelevant. This unfortunately is not so, because the integrated perturbation $\Delta z_{\rm res}$ increases with n. The three solutions in Table 9, whose n is, respectively, 18, 19, and 17, were selected from a total of about 800 solutions with $n \leq 20$. Their perturbation $\Delta z_{\rm res}$ always exceeds $+0.0015$ $(\mathrm{AU})^{-1}$ and is about three times as high as the relevant integrated perturbations $\Delta(1/a)$ in Table 8.

Judging from the unrealistically short orbital periods $P_{\rm fin}$, the solutions in Table 9 appear to be too powerful. To correct this problem and simultaneously reduce the magnitude of the integrated perturbation $\Delta z_{\rm res}$, we next restricted our search only to solutions with $n \leq 12$, which imply generally $\Delta z_{\rm res} < +0.0015$ $(\mathrm{AU})^{-1}$. Selected from a total of about 300 solutions, the three that fit best the conditions of cascade resonance are presented in Table 10, whose format is identical with that of Table 9.

An interesting, but apparently entirely fortuitous property of each of the three solutions in Table 10 is that an averaged deviation from a strict commensurability of the first five orbital periods, ϵ_5, is lower than that of the first four ones, ϵ_4. This indicates that the fifth period fits an integral multiple of the Jovian orbital period better than the average of the first four. In Table 9, the opposite was true in each case. By the time of the sixth return, when the resonance lock has been lost, the comet's orbital period is already near 1000 yr, so in this sense the solutions in Table 10 are almost as openly disposed to resonance as those in Table 9. The implied perturbation $\Delta z_{\rm res}$ in Table 10 is by about 300 units of 10^{-6} $(\mathrm{AU})^{-1}$ lower compared to Table 9, which is still a little more than twice as high as the relevant $\Delta(1/a)$ in Table 8.

In the context of comparing these universal schemes with the actual orbit integrations of the modeled motion for C/1846 O1, it should be recognized that the schemes serve only to guide us toward assessing our chances for achieving successful solutions to the problem of rapid systematic inward drifting of aphelion by orbital-cascade resonance. The schemes ignore the dependence on the heliocentric distance at fragmentation, disregard effects of the indirect planetary perturbations (unrelated to the Jovian encounter some 440 days after perihelion), and require that the integrated perturbation $\Delta z_{\rm res}$ be strictly invariable from orbit to orbit. In practical integrations, these conditions are of course not satisfied, so that the schemes are of only limited assistance.

Nonetheless, the schemes were quite helpful in demonstrating that near-perfect cascade resonance conditions, produced by the constant integrated perturbations of the reciprocal semimajor axis, are compatible with a broader random-walk pattern. They can in fact extend over at least four to five consecutive revolutions about the Sun, during which the rate of systematic inward drifting of aphelion is high enough to lead, at the time the resonance lock brakes down, to an orbital period that is about equal to, or shorter than, 1000 yr and thus comparable to the

Table 11

Comparison of Refined Orbit-Integration Runs for C/1846 O1 As Function of Orbital Location of Fragmentation Event

Distance from Sun at Breakup (AU)	Separation Velocity ($m\,s^{-1}$)		Return to Perihelion, k	Time of Perihelion Passage t_π (TT)	Anomal. Orbital Period P (yr)	Cascade resonance	Deviation $\delta_{k,k+1}$	Reciprocal Semimajor Axis[b] $1/a$ (AU^{-1})	Integrated Perturbation Δz_{res} (AU^{-1})	Encounter with Jupiter[c]		
	radial[a]	normal								Date of Closest Approach (TT)	Δt_π^J (days)	Distance Δ_J(AU)
569[d]	−1.010	+0.500	0	−14 326 Oct 12.91								
			1	−9558 Aug 13.41	4767.76	1:402	−0.061	+0.003530		−14 325 Dec 16	+430	0.9902
			2	−5833 Dec 12.88	3725.27	1:314	+0.053	+0.004161	+0.000631	−9556 Jan 16	+521	2.1766
			3	−3021 May 10.89	2811.36	1:237	+0.008	+0.005020	+0.000859	−5831 Feb 4	+420	0.9541
			4	−791 Mar 24.43	2229.83	1:188	−0.017	+0.005859	+0.000839	−3020 Jun 17	+404	0.8210
			5	1027 Dec 23.15	1818.72	1:153	+0.325	+0.006712	+0.000853	−790 May 29	+431	1.1360
700[e]	−0.432	+0.800	0	−14 326 Oct 21.80								
			1	−9617 Nov 7.89	4708.97	1:397	−0.014	+0.003559		−14 325 Dec 21	+426	0.9267
			2	−6307 May 21.04	3309.48	1:279	+0.001	+0.004503	+0.000944	−9615 Jan 21	+441	1.1281
			3	−3745 Jul 21.75	2562.13	1:216	−0.003	+0.005341	+0.000838	−6306 Jul 29	+434	1.0920
			4	−1681 Sept 6.76	2064.10	1:174	+0.011	+0.006168	+0.000827	−3744 Sept 27	+434	1.1060
			5	27 Aug 5.64	1707.88	1:144	−0.020	+0.006999	+0.000831	−1680 Oct 26	+416	0.9306
			6	1491 Mar 3.58	1463.55	1:123	+0.382	+0.007758	+0.000759	28 Oct 23	+445	1.2860
742[f]	−0.223	+0.900	0	−14 326 Oct 20.19								
			1	−9605 Nov 7.73	4721.02	1:398	−0.002	+0.003553		−14 325 Dec 19	+425	0.9317
			2	−6212 May 22.53	3392.51	1:286	+0.001	+0.004429	+0.000876	−9603 Jan 1	+421	0.9008
			3	−3650 Jun 18.19	2562.05	1:216	−0.010	+0.005341	+0.000912	−6211 Jul 15	+419	0.9134
			4	−1622 Sept 24.53	2028.25	1:171	−0.011	+0.006241	+0.000900	−3649 Aug 24	+432	1.0826
			5	87 Jan 12.72	1708.29	1:144	+0.015	+0.006998	+0.000757	−1621 Dec 21	+453	1.3552
			6	1532 Mar 25.24	1445.19	1:122	−0.165	+0.007823	+0.000825	88 Mar 15	+428	1.0634
700[g]	−0.155	+1.000	0	−14 326 Oct 9.49								
			1	−9652 Apr 25.88	4673.47	1:394	−0.010	+0.003577		−14 325 Dec 14	+431	0.9637
			2	−6390 Jun 19.88	3262.10	1:275	+0.007	+0.004546	+0.000969	−9651 Jul 4	+435	1.0347
			3	−3911 Jul 10.00	2479.02	1:209	−0.010	+0.005459	+0.000913	−6389 Aug 12	+419	0 8834
			4	−1966 Dec 7.97	1945.38	1:164	+0.002	+0.006417	+0.000958	−3910 Sept 12	+429	1.0314
			5	−388 Sept 19.38	1577.76	1:133	+0.011	+0.007379	+0.000962	−1964 Feb 4	+424	0.9887
			6	965 May 5.49	1352.60	1:114	+0.029	+0.008176	+0.000797	−387 Oct 31	+407	0.8338
500[h]	−0.066	+1.000	0	−14 326 Oct 7.80								
			1	−9593 Aug 14.34	4732.77	1:399	−0.007	+0.003548		−14 325 Dec 12	+431	0.9949
			2	−6272 Dec 25.05	3321.31	1:280	+0.001	+0.004492	+0.000944	−9592 Oct 22	+435	1.0674
			3	−3745 Aug 24.82	2526.62	1:213	+0.005	+0.005391	+0.000899	−6270 Mar 3	+433	1.0839
			4	−1717 Dec 14.34	2028.27	1:171	−0.008	+0.006241	+0.000850	−3744 Oct 19	+422	0.9658
			5	−20 Apr 14.53	1696.30	1:143	+0.006	+0.007031	+0.000790	−1715 Feb 23	+437	1.1725
			6	1394 Oct 21.45	1414.49	1:119	+0.248	+0.007936	+0.000905	−19 Jun 15	+427	1.0770
1.5[i]	−1.258	0.000	0	−14 421 Nov 20.53								
			1	−9913 May 27.52	4507.44	1:380	−0.003	+0.003665		−14 419 Jan 25	+432	1.0231
			2	−6699 Dec 6.87	3214.47	1:271	−0.006	+0.004591	+0.000926	−9912 Aug 2	+433	1.0596
			3	−4207 Feb 12.13	2491.14	1:210	+0.014	+0.005442	+0.000851	−6697 Feb 13	+434	1.1165
			4	−2203 Aug 29.47	2004.51	1:169	−0.011	+0.006290	+0.000848	−4206 Apr 1	+413	0.9159
			5	−550 Jan 20.88	1652.37	1:139	+0.302	+0.007155	+0.000865	−2202 Nov 3	+431	1.1268
			6	1163 Mar 3.44	1713.08	1:144	+0.420	+0.006985	−0.000170	−550 Apr 3	+73	4.2282

Notes.

[a] Rounded off.

[b] Determined from the anomalistic orbital period, P, in column 6 as $P^{-\frac{2}{3}}$.

[c] In the second column, Δt_π^J is the time of encounter reckoned from the perihelion time t_π.

[d] After aphelion. The fragmentation time was −15 796 Dec 12, about 1469.8 yr before the −14 326 perihelion passage.

[e] After aphelion. The fragmentation time was −16 835 Jan 23, about 2509.7 yr before the −14 326 perihelion passage.

[f] At aphelion. The fragmentation time was −17 908 Aug 16, about 3582.2 yr before the −14 326 perihelion passage; another aphelion solution, for the radial and normal components of the separation velocity of, respectively, −0.250 and +1.000 m s^{-1}, implied an initial perihelion passage at −14 326 Sept 20.33 TT and initial resonance of 1:399; the final orbital period (from Return 5 to Return 6) then came out to be P_{fin} = 1456.80 yr and the perihelion time at 1519 Dec 21.98 TT.

[g] Before aphelion. The fragmentation time was −18 970 Oct 11, about 4644.0 yr before the −14 326 perihelion passage.

[h] Before aphelion. The fragmentation time was −20 351 Feb 10, about 6025.7 yr before the −14 326 perihelion passage.

[i] Shortly after the previous perihelion. The fragmentation time was −21 480 May 27, about 7059.5 yr before the nominal perihelion passage, which was now in −14 421, 8 Jovian periods earlier than the −14 326 perihelion.

Table 12
Orbit-Integration Runs for C/1846 O1 as Function of Separation Velocity at Fragmentation

Distance from Sun at Breakup (AU)	Separation Velocity ($m\,s^{-1}$) radial[a]	normal	Return to Perihelion, k	Time of Perihelion Passage t_π (TT)	Anomal. Orbital Period P (yr)	Cascade resonance	Deviation $\delta_{k,k+1}$	Reciprocal Semimajor Axis[b] $1/a$ (AU^{-1})	Integrated Perturbation Δz_{res} (AU^{-1})	Encounter with Jupiter[c] Date of Closest Approach (TT)	Δt_π^J (days)	Distance Δ_J (AU)
700[d]	−0.155	+1.000	0	−14 326 Oct 9.49						−14 325 Dec 14	+431	0.9637
			1	−9652 Apr 25.88	4673.47	1:394	−0.010	+0.003577		−9651 Jul 4	+435	1.0347
			2	−6390 Jun 19.88	3262.10	1:275	+0.007	+0.004546	+0.000969	−6389 Aug 12	+419	0 8834
			3	−3911 Jul 10.00	2479.02	1:209	−0.010	+0.005459	+0.000913	−3910 Sept 12	+429	1.0314
			4	−1966 Dec 7.97	1945.38	1:164	+0.002	+0.006417	+0.000958	−1964 Feb 4	+424	0.9887
			5	−388 Sept 19.38	1577.76	1:133	+0.011	+0.007379	+0.000962	−387 Oct 31	+407	0.8338
			6	965 May 5.49	1352.60	1:114	+0.029	+0.008176	+0.000797			
700[d,e]	−0.175	+2.000	0	−14 326 Sept 23.66						−14 325 Dec 3	+436	0.9695
			1	−9759 Jul 31.03	4566.77	1:385	−0.001	+0.003633		−9758 Oct 5	+431	0.9609
			2	−6509 Sept 28.74	3250.11	1:274	−0.002	+0.004558	+0.000925	−6508 Dec 1	+430	0.9627
			3	−4077 Jun 15.50	2431.67	1:205	0.000	+0.005530	+0.000972	−4076 Aug 16	+428	0.9866
			4	−2167 Apr 1.28	1909.76	1:161	+0.001	+0.006497	+0.000967	−2166 Jun 1	+426	0.9902
			5	−625 Apr 16.22	1542.01	1:130	−0.002	+0.007492	+0.000995	−624 Jun 21	+432	1.0806
			6	690 Jan 14.75	1314.73	1:119	+0.248	+0.008333	+0.000841	689 Feb 2	−346	3.3972
			7	1921 Jun 16.06	1231.36	1:104	−0.191	+0.008704	+0.000371			

Notes.
[a] Rounded off.
[b] Determined from the anomalistic orbital period, P, in column 6 as $P^{-\frac{2}{3}}$.
[c] In the second column, Δt_π^J is the time of encounter reckoned from the perihelion time t_π.
[d] Before aphelion. The fragmentation time was −18 970 Oct 11, about 4644.0 yr before the −14 326 perihelion passage.
[e] Best-case scenario in terms of the final orbital period (minimum); other, independent solutions resulted in final periods from 1290 to 2000 yr.

orbital period of C/1846 O1 dictated by the observations (Section 3.2). Our experimentation confirmed that the integrated perturbation effect Δz_{res} was a function of the location of the fragmentation event in the parent comet's orbit, so that the significance of the apparent discordance between the values of Δz_{res} in Table 8 on the one hand and Tables 9 and 10 on the other hand, had to be appraised by examining the event's timing.

To accommodate cascade resonance, we next optimized the integration runs by stepwise modifying the radial component of the separation velocity (and thereby the perihelion and encounter times). We continued to involve, in addition, the normal, but not the transverse, component. However, solutions were not optimized to fit the comet's 1846 perihelion time. Our aim was limited to investigating the number of consecutive revolutions about the Sun over which the resonance lock was in effect, and to find out whether the final orbital period, at the time the lock broke down, fared well in comparison with the observed orbital period of C/1846 O1 (Section 3.2).

We began by assuming that the fragmentation event took place 569 AU from the Sun after aphelion, as in the early runs described in Section 4. By extensively varying the other parameters within tight limits, we tested the sensitivity of the solutions to conditions of cascade resonance, a process that consisted of hundreds of integration runs. At the end of this stage of experimentation we were able to bring the final orbital period down to 1819 yr, which is inconsistent with a 3σ limit (∼1600 yr), obtained in Section 3.2 from the comet's observations, by rather a narrow margin. This solution, the first entry in Table 11, indicates that cascade resonance unraveled after five returns to perihelion. The integrated perturbations Δz_{res} were found to be confined to a range from +0.000631 to +0.000859 $(AU)^{-1}$, with a mean of $+0.000796 \pm 0.000110$ $(AU)^{-1}$.

We next moved the parent comet's breakup to earlier times: first to a heliocentric distance of 700 AU after aphelion, then to aphelion itself, and then to three preaphelion locations. These solutions, listed in Table 11, offered steeper rates of inward drifting of aphelion than did the 569 AU case. The final orbital periods dropped below the 3σ limit of ∼1600 yr to 1464 yr in the 700 AU post-aphelion case; to 1445 yr in the aphelion case; to 1414 yr in the 500 AU preaphelion case; and to the shortest achieved period of 1353 yr in the 700 AU preaphelion case, in which the integrated perturbations Δz_{res} ranged from +0.000797 to +0.000969 $(AU)^{-1}$, with an average of $+0.000920 \pm 0.000072$ $(AU)^{-1}$. The resonance unraveled after 5–6 returns to perihelion in all scenarios except when the fragmentation event occurred at 569 AU preaphelion and near the previous perihelion.

Besides the orbits in Table 11, all derived for a total separation velocity of ∼1 m s^{-1}, further solutions were obtained for fragmentation at 700 AU preaphelion with a separation velocity of ∼2 m s^{-1}, essentially in the out-of-plane direction. One of these runs resulted in a final orbital period of 1231 yr, the shortest we found. Presented as the second entry in Table 12, its comparison with the first entry (copied from Table 11) confirms a modest effect of the normal separation velocity on the rate of inward drifting. As long as the resonance lock holds, the integrated perturbations Δz_{res} in this high-velocity case range from +0.000841 to +0.000995 $(AU)^{-1}$, averaging $+0.000940 \pm 0.000061$ $(AU)^{-1}$. Even though this is only slightly higher than in the respective low-velocity case, the corresponding difference in the final orbital period is seen to be more than 120 yr, or about 10%.

6. REMARKS ON RAPID INWARD DRIFTING SCENARIOS

To assess the significance of rapid inward drifting of aphelion for the evolution of comets, it is desirable to address the proposed orbital-cascade resonance process in terms of its orbit-changing power as well as from the standpoint of its likelihood of occurrence among comets.

6.1. *Rates of Orbital-Period Change*

The most obvious limitation of the process is that only Jupiter qualifies as a sufficiently effective perturber to allow this process to proceed. Because of Jupiter's position in the solar system, the process applies only to comets of orbital periods long enough that their aphelia are much more than an order of magnitude greater than the Jovian distance from the Sun. Crudely, a significant effect of this kind can be expected to manifest itself only with comets whose initial orbital period substantially exceeds ∼1000 yr. Such comets can experience resonances with Jupiter of 1:Γ, where $\Gamma \geq 100$. However, because the effect per encounter is approximately constant in terms of the reciprocal semimajor axis, $\Delta z_{\rm res}$, the respective rate of drop in the orbital period, $\Delta P_{\rm res}$, per encounter depends strongly on the period P itself,

$$\Delta P_{\rm res} = -\tfrac{3}{2} P^{\frac{5}{3}} \Delta z_{\rm res}, \qquad (\text{for } \Delta P_{\rm res} \ll P). \tag{16}$$

Accordingly, the process is most effective for comets in extremely elongated orbits and, for a given comet, in the course of the first few revolutions about the Sun after the initial encounter. This circumstance immediately leads to a notion that the process should be most effective for dynamically new comets. Indeed, if in the case we investigated in detail the comet were initially arriving from the Oort cloud and had an orbital period of ∼4 million yr, its period after the first Jovian encounter would be a mere 30,000 yr, or less than 1% of the original period. This is truly remarkable, given the encounters at rather common jovicentric distances of ∼1 AU. At the other extreme, comets with periods much shorter than 1000 yr could in the same situation drift inward at rates much lower than 150 yr per encounter. Among known comets with periods shorter than 1000 yr there is a group of about 20, whose Tisserand invariant with respect to Jupiter is $J < 2$, most of them with periods between 60 and 200 yr, that are sometimes referred to as Halley-type comets (Carusi et al. 1986). Several of them were found to avoid close encounters with Jupiter, their motions subject to libration patterns (Carusi et al. 1987a, 1987b). The librating comets were found to be in resonances of 1:5 to 1:7 with Jupiter, but because of the range of the orbital periods, there is a potential for resonances of up to 1:16, when investigated over a sufficiently long span of time.

6.2. *Verdict on the Pair of C/1846 O1 and C/1973 D1*

Returning now to our modeling of the inward drifting of C/1846 O1, we started from the time of fragmentation event of the parent comet of the presumed pair of C/1846 O1 and C/1973 D1, assumed to have occurred at some point of its orbit between the perihelion time in −14 326 and the previous perihelion passage, in −21 481. The solutions that led to the shortest final orbital periods, listed in Table 12, were based on the sets of osculation elements for C/1846 O1 at a selected location of the fragmentation event, 700 AU before aphelion, in the year −18 970. For the two choices of the normal component of the separation velocity, these elements are presented in Table 13. Notable are the large perihelion distances that dropped back to ∼1.4 AU by the time of next perihelion, as shown in Table 14, in which we summarize the results of orbit integration over 20–21 millennia.

Table 13
Orbital Elements for a Model of C/1846 O1 at Time of Assumed Fragmentation Event at 700 AU from the Sun Before Aphelion for Two Different Separation Velocities (Equinox J2000.0)

Orbital Element/Quantity	Separation velocity[a] (m s^{-1})	
	$V_{\rm R} = -0.155$ $V_{\rm N} = +1.0$	$V_{\rm R} = -0.175$ $V_{\rm N} = +2.0$
Osculation epoch ($0^{\rm h}$TT)	−18 970/10/11	−18 970/10/11
Time of perihelion t_π (TT)	−21 481/2/26.3	−21 481/2/12.8
Argument of perihelion ω	78°.8762	78°.4451
Longitude of ascending node Ω	171°.1843	170°.3916
Orbit inclination i	123°.0413	122°.8904
Perihelion distance q (AU)	1.953451	1.954285
Orbital eccentricity e	0.994749	0.994747
Orbital period P (yr) {osculation	7176.6	7176.5
Orbital period P (yr) {original[b]	7159.4	7159.4
Longitude of perihelion L_π	101°.0144	101°.0228
Latitude of perihelion B_π	+55°.3387	+55°.3553

Notes.
[a] $V_{\rm R}$ is the separation velocity's radial component, the minus sign indicating the sunward direction; while $V_{\rm N}$ is its normal component, the plus sign indicating the direction toward the north orbital pole.
[b] Referred to the barycenter of the Solar System.

The orbital solutions in Tables 13 and 14 do unfortunately include effects of chaotic motion owing to truncation in the computations. In Section 3.5 we mentioned that after four encounters with Jupiter, a truncation error accumulating over 20 000 yr is no longer negligible even in high-precision computations (17 digits), amounting to 1300 seconds. In addition, truncation errors increase exponentially with the number of encounters of approximately equal perturbation effects. Given that the error accumulated over 20 000 yr with encounters absent is in a subsecond range, an expected truncation error amounts to 0.12 days after five encounters, 1 day after six encounters, and 8 days after seven encounters.

It therefore appears that the resonance lock broken after 5–7 returns to perihelion was not a product of orbital nature, but was brought on computationally by truncation errors. If so, one could expect that cascading resonance might have continued. Should this be the case, the results in Tables 11–14 suggest that the orbital period of the modeled comet C/1846 O1 could eventually get below 1000 yr, but certainly not by 1846.

We thus arrive at a conclusion that it was the *much too slow rate of inward aphelion drifting* caused by the inadequate Jovian perturbations, *not* the *broken lock of cascade resonance*, that prevented the final orbital period to drop below ∼1200 yr in our orbit integrations. This explanation is supported by comparison with the computational schemes listed in Tables 9–10. While the genuine perturbations obtained by integrating the motion of C/1846 O1 always remained, however slightly, below $\Delta z_{\rm res} = 0.001000\ (\text{AU})^{-1}$ per revolution, the schematic sequences of perturbations that fitted the required rate of inward drifting necessitated, in the least, the rates of

Table 14
Orbital Elements from Cascade Resonance Solutions for a Model of C/1846 O1 on Assumption That Fragmentation Event Occurred 700 AU from the Sun Before Aphelion (Equinox J2000.0)

Orbital Element/Quantity	Initial	Return 1	Return 2	Return 3	Return 4	Return 5	Return 6	Return 7
Fragmentation[a] on −18 970/10/11 at 700 AU preaphelion; $V_R = -0.155$ m s^{-1}, $V_N = +1.0$ m s^{-1}								
Osculation epoch (0^hTT)	−14 326/10/9	−9652/4/25	−6390/6/19	−3911/7/10	−1966/12/7	−388/9/19	965/5/5	.....
Time of perihelion[b] t_π (TT)	9.4900	25.8828	19.8808	9.9915	7.9653	19.3793	5.4926	.....
Argument of perihelion ω	74°.7494	74°.5224	74°.3276	74°.0651	73°.9435	73°.7712	73°.4707	.....
Longitude of ascending node Ω	163°.8736	164°.1419	164°.3590	164°.5962	164°.9077	165°.1546	165°.3308	.....
Orbit inclination i	121°.3932	121°.7739	122°.1524	122°.5205	122°.8729	123°.2873	123°.7066	.....
Perihelion distance q (AU)	1.405211	1.391676	1.381553	1.368640	1.360044	1.349569	1.331931	.....
Orbital eccentricity e	0.997150	0.995942	0.994589	0.993402	0.992143	0.990910	0.989975	.....
Osculation orbital period P (yr)	10 948	6351	4080	2987	2278	1809	1531	.....
Longitude of perihelion L_π	101°.5011	101°.8803	102°.1578	102°.5687	102°.8429	103°.0934	103°.4676	.....
Latitude of perihelion B_π	+55°.4420	+55°.0150	+54°.6031	+54°.1740	+53°.8147	+53°.3811	+52°.8931	.....
Encounter with Jupiter:								
Date (TT)	−14 325/12/14	−9651/7/4	−6389/8/12	−3910/9/12	−1964/2/4	−387/10/31	.....	.....
Time from perihelion (days)	+431	+435	+419	+429	+424	+407	.....	.....
Minimum distance (AU)	0.9637	1.0347	0.8834	1.0314	0.9887	0.8338	.....	.....
Fragmentation[a] on −18 970/10/11 at 700 AU preaphelion; $V_R = -0.175$ m s^{-1}, $V_N = +2.0$ m s^{-1}								
Osculation epoch (0^hTT)	−14 326/9/23	−9759/7/31	−6509/9/28	−4077/6/15	−2167/4/1	−625/4/16	690/1/14	1921/6/16
Time of perihelion[b] t_π (TT)	23.6567	31.0311	28.7418	15.4975	1.2760	16.2152	14.7519	16.0587
Argument of perihelion ω	74°.2892	74°.0808	73°.8139	73°.6429	73°.4853	73°.3498	73°.1971	73°.0949
Longitude of ascending node Ω	162°.9830	163°.2229	163°.4118	163°.6511	163°.9885	164°.2675	164°.6014	164°.8012
Orbit inclination i	121°.1644	121°.5786	121°.9623	122°.3262	122°.7522	123°.1859	123°.4680	123°.5763
Perihelion distance q (AU)	1.410436	1.394450	1.382333	1.368514	1.354352	1.341977	1.335056	1.344340
Orbital eccentricity e	0.997138	0.995852	0.994558	0.993364	0.992115	0.990845	0.989685	0.988646
Osculation orbital period P (yr)	10 939	6163	4048	2961	2251	1775	1472	1288
Longitude of perihelion L_π	101°.5098	101°.7981	102°.1489	102°.4122	102°.7129	102°.9190	103°.3055	103°.5917
Latitude of perihelion B_π	+55°.4588	+55°.0099	+54°.5644	+54°.1757	+53°.7383	+53°.3032	+52°.9945	+52°.8586
Encounter with Jupiter:								
Date (TT)	−14 325/12/3	−9758/10/5	−6508/12/1	−4076/8/16	−2166/6/1	−624/6/21	689/2/2	.....
Time from perihelion (days)	+436	+431	+430	+428	+426	+432	−346	.....
Minimum distance (AU)	0.9695	0.9609	0.9627	0.9866	0.9902	1.0806	3.3972	.....

Notes.

[a] V_R is the separation velocity's radial component, the minus sign indicating the sunward direction; while V_N is its normal component, the plus sign indicating the direction toward the north orbital pole.

[b] The year and month of perihelion is always identical with the year and month of the osculation epoch.

$\Delta z_{res} \approx 0.001200$ (AU)$^{-1}$ per revolution, but preferably $\Delta z_{res} \geq 0.001700$ (AU)$^{-1}$ per revolution, in order for the orbital period to drop, by 1846, below ∼1000 yr after the first four returns. If, as noted in Section 3.2, a 1σ final orbital period of C/1846 O1 is less than this limit, the examined scenario fails to explain this comet's evolution.

In addition, Table 14 shows that the long-term trends in the comet's other elements are likewise unfavorable to the modeled scenario. This is particularly true about the argument of perihelion, in which C/1846 O1 and C/1973 D1 differ most significantly. Whereas the observed value of this angular element is by 2°.5 greater for C/1846 O1, the model in Table 14 requires that it actually be smaller than that for C/1973 D1, deviating from the expected value by about 4°. The results are also rather disappointing in the other two angular elements, with only the perihelion distance being in fair agreement with expectation. Overall, these findings support a conclusion that C/1846 O1 and C/1973 D1 either are *not genetically related* or otherwise followed an evolutionary path *different* from the one we proposed and examined; in Section 7 we briefly offer some speculations.

6.3. *Likelihood of Orbital-Cascade Resonance Among Long-Period Comets*

To estimate the likelihood of a long-period comet getting locked into orbital-cascade resonance, we employ a model of constant integrated perturbation Δz_{res} introduced in Section 3.9. This is permissible because, on the one hand, the orbital computations leading to Tables 11 and 12 show that the condition is approximately satisfied in the course of the cascade-resonance process and, on the other hand, comparison of Tables 9 and 10 with Tables 11 and 12, suggests common similarities in terms of the deviations $\delta_{k,k+1}$ [defined by Equation (15)] from exact resonance. We employed these resonance deviations from the 1:370 through 1:430 commensurabilities, that is 61 sets of model scenarios, for each of which we considered resonance spanning 10 through 19 returns to perihelion. Although these numbers of returns are excessive, it turns out that there is no correlation between the distribution of the deviations and the number of returns. Besides, we were interested only in the deviations ϵ_4 and ϵ_5, averaged, respectively, over the first four and five returns to perihelion, as defined by Equation (11).



Figure 6. Cumulative distribution ν_4 of the averaged deviation ϵ_4 from exact commensurability with the Jovian orbital period (1:370 through 1:430) after four consecutive returns. The solid curve is expressed by Equation (23), the dotted curve is an ϵ_4^2 approximation. The distribution is normallized to $\nu_4(\frac{1}{2}) = 1$.

A cumulative distribution of the averaged deviations ϵ_4 is presented in Figure 6. The plot shows clearly that in the range of small deviations, which we are interested in, the cumulative distribution increases with the square of ϵ_4. From the definition it follows that no deviation $\delta_{k,k+1}$ can exceed $\frac{1}{2}$, so that $\nu(\epsilon_4)$, the cumulative distribution of ϵ_4, may be written in the form

$$\nu(\epsilon_4) = \nu_4 = A\,\epsilon_4^2\,f(\epsilon_4), \tag{17}$$

where A is a constant, while $f(\epsilon_4)$ is a normalizing function that has to satisfy a constraint

$$f(\tfrac{1}{2}) = \frac{4}{A} \tag{18}$$

and two convergence conditions

$$\lim_{\epsilon_4 \to 0} f(\epsilon_4) = 1 \tag{19}$$

and, in order that $d\nu_4/d\epsilon_4 > 0$ for any $\epsilon_4 \leq \frac{1}{2}$,

$$\lim_{\epsilon_4 \to \frac{1}{2}} \frac{df(\epsilon_4)}{d\epsilon_4} > -\frac{16}{A}. \tag{20}$$

It turns out that the slope $d(\ln \nu_4))/d(\ln \epsilon_4)$ must be systematically decreasing with ϵ_4 in order to satisfy these conditions, given the data plotted in Figure 6. We find that a Gaussian,

$$f(\epsilon_4) = \exp\left(-B\epsilon_4^2\right), \tag{21}$$

satisfies these conditions very well. The condition that ν_4 be an increasing function requires a constraint $B < 4$, while the normalization, $\nu_4(\frac{1}{2}) = 1$, imposes the following relation between the constants B and A:

$$B = 4 \ln\left(\frac{A}{4}\right). \tag{22}$$

A satisfactory fit to the data points in Figure 6 is provided by a formula

$$\begin{underset{\pm 0.83}{\nu_4 = 9.82}\,\epsilon_4^2 \exp\big(\underset{\pm 0.34}{-3.58}\,\epsilon_4^2\big).} \tag{23}$$

We also investigated the cumulative distribution $\nu(\epsilon_5)$ of an averaged deviation from exact commensurability at the first five returns, ϵ_5, and found that the data obeyed the same type of law, namely,

$$\begin{underset{\pm 0.51}{\nu(\epsilon_5) = \nu_5 = 5.02}\,\epsilon_5^2 \exp\big(\underset{\pm 0.41}{-0.91}\,\epsilon_5^2\big).} \tag{24}$$

Somewhat surprisingly, at the same level of ϵ_m, the probablility of five consecutive near-resonance returns to perihelion is as high as $\sim\frac{1}{2}$ the probability of four such consecutive returns.

We emphasize that the sequence of solutions introduced by Equation (8) is quite general, not limited to the circumstances of the modeled evolution of C/1846 O1. Numerically, we find from the eight runs listed in Tables 11 and 12 that an average ϵ_4 is near 0.01, so once a comet gets perturbed into a commensurable orbit upon its approach to Jupiter, the probability of its motion getting locked into cascade resonance over four successive returns to perihelion is about 10^{-3} and over five successive returns about 0.5×10^{-3}.

The probability of a temporary resonance lock is fairly low, but the likelihood of detecting a comet subjected to this process is in fact higher, because — as its orbital period gets progressively shorter — it enters, per unit time, the perihelion region ever more often than a comet whose motion does not get locked into cascade resonance.

6.4. *Integrated Perturbations Under Condition of Fairly Close Encounter with Jupiter*

In Section 6.1 we expressed a conviction that, as a driver of rapid inward drifting of aphelion, the process of high-order orbital resonance should — in the presence of regularly recurring fairly close encounters with Jupiter — be responsible for the existence of long-period comets with a short post-Oort-Cloud history. To place the rigorously determined Jovian perturbations integrated over one revolution about the Sun in the context of the basic variables of the perturbation theory, we write $\Delta(1/a)$, a perturbation of the reciprocal semimajor axis integrated over a revolution and representing a total energy change, as a function of the orbital elements (the eccentricity e, the parameter p, and the orbital period P) and the radial and transverse components of the perturbation acceleration, $\wp_{\rm R}(t)$ and $\wp_{\rm T}(t)$, (e.g., Danby 1988):

$$\Delta(1/a) = -\frac{2\sqrt{p}}{k}\left[\frac{e}{p}\int_{(P)} \wp_{\rm R} \sin v\, dt + \int_{(P)} \frac{\wp_{\rm T}}{r}\, dt\right], \tag{25}$$

where k is the Gaussian gravitational constant, and the comet's orbital position at time t is defined by a heliocentric distance $r(t)$ and a true anomaly $v(t)$. Although



Figure 7. Schematic representation of the matched-conic approximation, applied by Everhart (1969) in deriving an integrated perturbation $\Delta(1/a)$, per revolution, as a result of a close encounter with Jupiter. The comet moves from the right to the left along the thick-drawn trajectory. The angle between the approach and departure trajectory branches is 2θ, the distance at the time of closest approach to Jupiter is Δ_J, whereas $\Im_J$ is a minimum distance from Jupiter along the unperturbed trajectory (an impact parameter), and $\boldsymbol{V_J}$ and $\boldsymbol{E_J}$ are, respectively, Jupiter's orbital velocity vector and a unit vector along the Jupiter–comet direction at perijove.

the integration is carried out over an entire revolution about the Sun, much of the total effect in the case of a fairly close encounter comes from the perturbations along a rather short arc centered on the point of closest approach.

Everhart (1969) investigated the problem of orbital perturbations as a result of close encounters of comets, initially in parabolic orbits, with the planets and showed that insight into the problem of an energy change is provided by a matched-conic approximation,[14] which uses analytic expressions and offers results that agree with the results based on the exact, numerical solution fairly satisfactorily. This approximation is shown schematically in Figure 7. Everhart wrote the energy perturbation in dimensionless units; using the absolute units, his expression for the $1/a$ perturbation integrated over an encounter with Jupiter, which is assumed to move about the Sun in a circular orbit[15] of radius r_J, has the form as follows:

$$\Delta(1/a) = \frac{4V_{\rm rel}\sin\theta}{r_J V_J^2}\,(\boldsymbol{V_J}\cdot\boldsymbol{E_J}), \qquad (26)$$

where $V_{\rm rel}$ is the magnitude of the asymptotic velocity of the comet relative to Jupiter before the encounter (as well as after encounter, except for the direction), $\boldsymbol{V_J}$ is the vector of Jupiter's orbital velocity, whose magnitude is V_J, $\boldsymbol{E_J}$ is a unit vector from Jupiter to the comet at the time of closest approach, the dot signifying a scalar product, and 2θ is the angle by which the direction of the departing branch of the comet's trajectory deviates from that of the approaching trajectory (Figure 7). Angle θ is related to the Jovian mass, $\mathcal{M}_J$, by

$$\tan\theta = \frac{\mathcal{M}_J}{\mathcal{M}_\odot}\,\frac{r_J}{\Im_J}\,\frac{V_J^2}{V_{\rm rel}^2}, \qquad (27)$$

where $\mathcal{M}_\odot$ is the Sun's mass and $\Im_J$ is the distance of the unperturbed approach trajectory from Jupiter, which Everhart calls an impact parameter. As the quantity of primary interest to us is the comet's distance from Jupiter at the time of closest approach, Δ_J, we note that it is related to $\Im_J$ by

$$\Delta_J = \Im_J\,\frac{1-\sin\theta}{\cos\theta}. \qquad (28)$$

After inserting for $\Im_J$ from Equation (28) to (27) and then for θ from Equation (27) to (26), we find that

$$\Delta(1/a) = 4\,\frac{\mathcal{M}_J}{\mathcal{M}_\odot}\,\frac{(\boldsymbol{V_J}\cdot\boldsymbol{E_J})}{\Delta_J V_{\rm rel}(1+\Psi)}, \qquad (29)$$

where

$$\Psi = \frac{\mathcal{M}_J}{\mathcal{M}_\odot}\,\frac{r_J}{\Delta_J}\,\frac{V_J^2}{V_{\rm rel}^2} = \frac{\sin\theta}{1-\sin\theta}. \qquad (30)$$

In the limiting case, $\lim_{\theta\to 0}\Psi \simeq \theta(1+\theta)$.

As an example of the degree of accuracy provided by Equation (29), we compare the approximate values of $\Delta(1/a)$ with the numbers computed rigorously; the latter of course include all perturbing bodies, not just Jupiter. The results, in Table 15, suggest that the approximation, expressed by Equation (29), yields $\Delta(1/a)$ values that are, on the average, 25 ± 6 % higher than are the $\Delta z_{\rm res}$ values from the rigorous computations.

The value of Ψ in Equation (29) can be perceived as a correction term, for which we find $\Psi \ll 1$ (and $\theta \ll 30^\circ$) when $\Delta_J \gg 0.005\,(V_J/V_{\rm rel})^2$, that is, for nearly all encounters. Equation (29) then indicates that, excluding cases of exceptionally close encounters, $\Delta(1/a)$ varies inversely as a product of the distance at closest approach and the relative velocity, $\Delta(1/a) \propto \Delta_J^{-1} V_{\rm rel}^{-1}$, confirming the well-known facts that the integrated perturbation is the greater the closer the approach is and the slower the comet moves relative to Jupiter.

During Jovian encounters of comets, whose perihelion distances are much smaller than the distance of Jupiter from the Sun, their motion is nearly perpendicular to the planet's motion and their heliocentric velocities $\sqrt{2}$ times higher, resulting in relative velocities that can reasonably be approximated by $V_{\rm rel} \simeq V_J\sqrt{3}$. Taking now $\Psi \to 0$, inserting the numerical values of the constants, and recognizing that $|\boldsymbol{V_J}\cdot\boldsymbol{E_J}| \le V_J$, the perturbation from Equation (29) becomes in absolute value

$$|\Delta(1/a)| \le \frac{0.0022}{\Delta_J}\,({\rm AU})^{-1}\,{\rm rev}^{-1}. \qquad (31)$$

Given further that the averaging of the angle between $\boldsymbol{V_J}$ and $\boldsymbol{E_J}$ that is randomly distributed over $\pi/2$ results in $\langle|\boldsymbol{V_J}\cdot\boldsymbol{E_J}|\rangle = 2V_J/\pi$, we find

$$\langle|\Delta(1/a)|\rangle \simeq \frac{0.0014}{\Delta_J}\,({\rm AU})^{-1}\,{\rm rev}^{-1}. \qquad (32)$$

[14] In relation to the problem of earth-moon trajectories in space missions, a matched-conic approximation was earlier examined by Lagerstrom & Kevorkian (1963).

[15] The subsequently introduced ellipticity of Jupiter's orbit was shown by Everhart (1972) to have no effect on the rate of capture and the longitudinal distribution of perihelia.

Table 15
Comparison of the integrated perturbation $\Delta(1/a)$ for the best[a] cascade-resonance solution, established from the matched-conic approximation (Jovian effects only), with $\Delta z_{\rm res}$, derived from rigorous computations.

Perihelion Passage	Initial	Return 1	Return 2	Return 3	Return 4
Date of encounter with Jupiter	−14 325 Dec 3	−9758 Oct 5	−6508 Dec 1	−4076 Aug 16	−2166 Jun 1
Jovian heliocentric distance, $r_{\rm J}$ (AU)	5.1080	5.0868	5.0562	5.0358	5.0284
Jovian orbital velocity, $V_{\rm J}$ (km s^{-1})	13.3051	13.3585	13.4379	13.4907	13.5086
Comet's Jovicentric distance at closest approach, $\Delta_{\rm J}$ (AU)	0.9695	0.9609	0.9627	0.9866	0.9902
Comet's Jovicentric velocity, $V_{\rm rel}$ (km s^{-1})	24.7033	24.7912	24.8817	24.9229	25.0014
Angle between vectors $\boldsymbol{V_{\rm J}}$ and $\boldsymbol{E_{\rm J}}$	55°.2325	55°.3639	55°.7383	55°.1942	56°.2399
Angle 2θ between approach and departure trajectories	0°.1669	0°.1678	0°.1673	0°.1633	0°.1619
Correction term Ψ	0.001458	0.001467	0.001462	0.001427	0.001415
Perturbation $\Delta(1/a)$ from Eq. (29) (AU^{-1}rev^{-1})	+0.001207	+0.001215	+0.001204	+0.001194	+0.001156
Perturbation $\Delta z_{\rm res}$ integrated rigorously[b] (AU^{-1}rev^{-1})	+0.000941	+0.000925	+0.000972	+0.000967	+0.000995

Note.

[a] As referred to in note e in Table 12.

[b] As listed in column 10 of Table 12.

Jovicentric velocities of comets whose perihelion distances are comparable to the heliocentric distance of Jupiter, depend critically on the orbital inclination. The relations (31) and (32) apply approximately when the inclination is near 90°, but deviate from them increasingly as the inclination approaches 0° (prograde orbits) or 180° (retrograde orbits), when the relative velocity converges to, respectively, $V_{\rm rel} = (\sqrt{2}-1)V_{\rm J}$ and $V_{\rm rel} = (\sqrt{2}+1)V_{\rm J}$. Relation (31) should for comets in essentialy coplanar orbits with perihelion distances near Jupiter be replaced with

$$\Delta(1/a) \leq \frac{0.0092}{\Delta_{\rm J}}\ ({\rm AU})^{-1}\,{\rm rev}^{-1} \qquad (33)$$

for prograde motions, and with

$$\Delta(1/a) \leq \frac{0.0016}{\Delta_{\rm J}}\ ({\rm AU})^{-1}\,{\rm rev}^{-1} \qquad (34)$$

for retrograde motions. For perihelia near Jupiter, the numerical coefficient in relation (32) should likewise be higher for prograde orbits but lower for retrograde orbits, compared to its value for small perihelion distances.

The retrograde-to-prograde ratio of 0.17 for cometary perihelia close to Jupiter compares rather favorably with the respective results of two independent investigations of 20 000 hypothetical comets in randomly distributed parabolic orbits, published by Šteins & Kronkalne (1964) and by Fernández (1981). Likewise, the above relations are generally consistent with the conclusion reached on the basis of more than 180 000 hypothetical long-period comets by Everhart (1968), who found that the $\Delta(1/a)$ perturbation as a function of perihelion distance depends on the comet's inclination: in prograde orbits and orbits moderately exceeding 90° a peak effect is attained at a perihelion distance comparable with the orbital radius of the perturbing planet, whereas for retrograde orbits an inconspicuously pronounced maximum takes place at perihelion distances near zero. Everhart's (1968) result averaged over all inclinations shows a slight drop in the perturbations only at perihelion distances smaller than ∼0.4 AU, but a systematic increase with increasing perihelion distance by a factor of about 1.4 between 1 and 3 AU. The peak is reached at 5 AU, with a steep drop ensuing at $r > r_{\rm J}$.

In the context of the process of comet diffusion, the role of high-order orbital-cascade resonance is reminiscent of very close encounters with Jupiter — the integrated perturbations in both cases trigger major changes in the total orbital energy, except that the latter mode requires no orbital-period commensurability. Our computations for C/1846 O1 illustrate how dramatic the similarity really is. The peak total energy change, integrated over all returns to perihelion (starting with those during which the orbital motion was in the cascade-resonance lock), is represented by the second solution in Tables 12 (referred to as the best-case scenario in footnote e) and 14: the reduction of the orbital period from 7159.4 yr (Table 13) at the fragmentation time to the final period of 1231.36 yr (Table 12) signifies an integrated effect of $\Delta(1/a) = +0.008704 - 0.002692 = +0.006012\ ({\rm AU})^{-1}$, which — with the values for the various parameters averaged[16] from the data listed in Table 15 — is equivalent to an effect of a single close encounter with a minimum Jovicentric distance of $\Delta_{\rm J} \simeq 0.194$ AU. From Sitarski's (1968) results it follows that only one long-period comet observed between 1800 and the end of 1967 approached Jupiter to a similarly small distance, namely, C/1932 P1 to 0.198 AU before perihelion. The next three ones were C/1840 E1, approaching the planet to 0.308 AU (before perihelion); C/1823 Y1 to 0.448 AU (after perihelion);[17] and C/1917 H1 to 0.489 AU (before perihelion).

The rate of inward aphelion drifting in this best-case scenario is depicted in Figure 8. It shows this rate to decrease gradually from nearly 200 AU per revolution after the initial perihelion passage in the year −14 326 to merely 10 AU per revolution between Returns 6 and 7 at the beginning of the 14th century AD.

Expanding now on the point discussed in Section 6.1, we confirm that, over an interval of not more than a few dozen millenia, the process of high-order orbital-cascade resonance could, under recurring Jovian approaches to ∼1 AU, bring about changes in the orbital periods of the

[16] Adopting $M_{\rm J}/\mathcal{M}_{\odot} = 0.00095425$, $(\boldsymbol{V_{\rm J}}\cdot\boldsymbol{E_{\rm J}}) = 7.5909$ km s^{-1}, $V_{\rm rel} = 24.8601$ km s^{-1}, and $\Psi = 0.001446$.

[17] A new, elliptical orbit for C/1823 Y1 was computed by us in Paper 1, implying that the distance of closest approach to Jupiter was 0.453 AU on 1824 Nov 14, in agreement with Sitarski's (1968) result, which is off by only −0.005 AU and −1 day, respectively.



Figure 8. Computed rate of inward drifting of the aphelion distance, driven by high-order orbital-cascade resonance, as function of the perihelion return. This is the best-case scenario modeled for the motion of comet C/1846 O1. The first entry on the upper left is the aphelion distance after the fragmentation event in the year −18 970, but before the initial perihelion passage in the year −14 326 (Return 0). The last entry on the lower right is the aphelion distance between Returns 6 and 7 (Table 14), whose perihelion passages occurred, respectively, in the years 690 and 1921. The final aphelion distance is greater than the nominal value derived from the observations (Table 4) by more than 100 AU, but it is very close to its upper 2σ limit.

Oort-Cloud comets as prominent as a single approach to about 0.2 AU of Jupiter could over a span of weeks or months: for a comet with its perihelion much closer to the Sun than Jupiter, the period could be reduced from ∼4 million yr to ∼1700 yr, while in the case of a near-perihelion encounter, to as little as ∼200 yr!

7. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A statistical investigation of pairs and groups of long-period comets, undertaken in terms of the Southworth-Hawkins D-criterion by Kresák (1982), resulted in a 20% expectation for comets C/1846 O1 and C/1973 D1 making up a random pair. The expectation drops to 11% when the highly inaccurate orbits of the pre-19th-century comets are removed from the sample. The degree of expectation that would indicate the presence, in a random sample, of a nonrandom event is essentially a matter of convention. However, as a rule of thumb, a lower-than-5% random-event expectation is usually interpreted to mean that the pair's members are genetically related, while a higher-than-25% random-event expectation suggests that their relationship is highly doubtful. The degree of expectation for the comet pair C/1846 O1 and C/1973 D1 is in a "grey" zone between the two limits, so their genetic relationship is uncertain. Similarly, Lindblad (1985) found that the number of groups of long-period comets varied with the D-criterion approximately as the upper 2σ confidence limit of the number of comet groups determined from searches in 20 random samples.

As a statistical tool, the D-criterion appears to be unfit for testing the common origin of any specific comets. Accordingly, we felt that it was desirable to explore the potential relationship of the pair of C/1846 O1 and C/1973 D1 by more rigorous techniques.

The first step was to reexamine the orbital motions of the two comets. The outcome, in Table 4, shows that our orbit for C/1973 D1 was remarkably similar to that determined by Marsden et al. (1978), implying an original orbital period of $16\,300 \pm 420$ yr. On the other hand, the currently cataloged orbit for C/1846 O1 — Vogel's (1868) set of parabolic elements with the planetary perturbations unaccounted for — was found to be unacceptable and in need of major revision. Our work revealed for the first time that the comet's significant orbital property was a strong deviation from parabolic motion, with a probable orbital period of ∼500 yr and not longer than ∼1600 yr (3σ; Table 3). This result unexpectedly complicated the problem of common origin of the two comets by introducing a fundamental and previously unrecognized stumbling block — an enormous mismatch in their orbital periods. However, assuming a genetical relationship, the intrinsic brightness suggested that C/1973 D1 should be a companion to C/1846 O1, while the orbital period of C/1973 D1 implied that the parent's splitting should have occurred more than ∼16 000 yr ago.

Integration of the orbital motion of C/1973 D1 back in time showed that because of an encounter with Jupiter, the planet's perturbations could either accelerate the comet into an orbit of larger dimensions or decelerate it into an orbit of smaller dimensions relative to those prior to the encounter, depending on the comet's position with respect to the planet at the previous return in the year −14 326. A full range of orbital change achieved during one complete Jovian orbital period (which equals merely 0.013 the rms uncertainty of the comet's orbital period), amounts to 0.00196 $(\mathrm{AU})^{-1}$ in the barycentric reciprocal semimajor axis, $1/a_\mathrm{b}$. The motions of the two comets would have been subjected to this differential effect if, in the year −14 326, they passed perihelion about 264 days, or almost 9 months, apart. The perturbation curve was far from symmetric, the maximum acceleration reaching -0.00113 $(\mathrm{AU})^{-1}$ and the maximum deceleration $+0.00083$ $(\mathrm{AU})^{-1}$. If the pre-encounter orbital periods were alike, C/1846 O1 must have been decelerated during the Jovian encounter and the trailing C/1973 D1 accelerated. Indeed, the pre-encounter (original) orbital period of C/1973 D1 equaled 7160 yr (Table 7), equivalent to $(1/a_\mathrm{b})_\mathrm{orig} = 0.00156 + 0.00113 = +0.00269$ $(\mathrm{AU})^{-1}$ and the approximate post-encounter (future) orbital period of the modeled C/1846 O1 was near 4800 yr,[18] equivalent to $(1/a_\mathrm{b})_\mathrm{fut} = 0.00269 + 0.00083 = +0.00352$ $(\mathrm{AU})^{-1}$, in excellent agreement with the initial results of our rigorous computations (Table 8).

These initial computations were based on a condition that the radial component of the separation velocity between C/1846 O1 and C/1973 D1, which is the dominant parameter determining the magnitude of the gap between the two objects at the time of the −14 326 perihelion, be exactly 1 m s^{-1}. In order for comet C/1846 O1 to pass through perihelion first, it was required that the com-

[18] This result is approximate because of the neglected effect of a separation velocity at the time of fragmentation.

panion (C/1973 D1) be released from the parent comet in the antisolar direction relative to the primary fragment (C/1846 O1).[19] The 1 m s^{-1} constraint was satisfied by assigning the fragmentation event a time some 1470 yr before the −14 326 perihelion, when the parent was at a heliocentric distance of 569 AU along the incoming leg of the orbit (i.e., post-aphelion). In this scenario, the modeled C/1846 O1 approached Jupiter to 0.99 AU about 430 days after perihelion, in −14 325 December (Table 8), while C/1973 D1 approached the planet to 0.87 AU about 600 days after perihelion, in −14 324 early June.

The early forward-integration runs for the modeled motion of C/1846 O1 beyond the year −14 326 showed that the initial post-fragmentation orbital period of this object was equal to slightly less than 4800 yr (Table 8). Even though this is dramatically (by a factor of more than 3) shorter than the orbital period of C/1973 D1 (4800 yr vs 16 300 yr), it was deemed requisite that the period of C/1846 O1 be further reduced by a factor of 3–4 to bring it to at least a modest agreement with the orbital period of C/1846 O1 derived from the observations (Sec. 3.2); a near-perfect correspondence would require a factor of close to 10.

In an effort to slash the comet's consumed orbital time as much as possible, we examined the dependence of the initial post-fragmentation orbital period (between the year −14 326 and Return 1) on the normal component of the separation velocity and on the fragmentation time. As shown in Tables 8 and 12, a normal component of the separation velocity[20] of 1–2 m s^{-1} led to a slightly shorter initial post-fragmentation orbital period (by 1–2%). The shortest initial periods were obtained for a fragmentation event taking place ∼700 AU from the Sun before aphelion, in the year −18 970 (or 4644 yr before the −14 326 perihelion), the minimum initial post-fragmentation period amounting then to <4600 yr (Table 12), when the unlikely solution for fragmentation near the previous perihelion in the 22st millennium BCE (Table 11) is ignored.

The described rationale not only resulted in a substantial reduction in the initial post-fragmentation orbital period of the modeled motion of C/1846 O1, but it also accentuated the merit of the applied numerical experiment, which aimed — by exploiting the perturbation effects during the recurring moderate encounters with Jupiter — at repetitively slashing the orbital period over several consecutive revolutions about the Sun. The urgent need for an additional reduction of the orbital period of C/1846 O1 was illustrated by the factor of more than 9 between the shortest initial post-fragmentation period of ∼4600 yr and the ultimate target of ∼500 yr (Table 4). The clue to this experiment's success was to temporarily lock the comet's motion into high-order orbital-cascade resonance, a process in which the aphelion was rapidly drifting inward over several consecutive revolutions about the Sun, while the orbital period was successively equal to gradually decreasing integral multiples of the Jovian orbital period.

[19] As it was the orbit of C/1973 D1 that, because of its considerably higher accuracy, was taken in our computations as a reference orbit, this condition was implemented by releasing C/1846 O1 toward the Sun relative to C/1973 D1.

[20] The positive sign of the velocity in Tables 8 and 12 means that the companion C/1973 D1 was, relative to the primary C/1846 O1, released to the south of the parent's orbital plane.

The solution that we refer to as the best-case scenario offered for C/1846 O1 an initial post-fragmentation orbital period of 4567 yr (Table 12) and resulted — after seven returns to perihelion (even though over only first five returns was the orbital period in a resonance lock with Jupiter's period in a ratio of, respectively, 1:385, 1:274, 1:205, 1:161, and 1:130) — in the comet's final orbital period of 1231 yr, the shortest final period that we were able to come up with. This period is shorter than the estimated 3σ upper limit (Table 3) to, but still nearly 2.5 times longer than, the most probable period for C/1846 O1 listed in Table 4. Because of the additional problems (such as a discrepancy of about 4° in the comet's argument of perihelion), we concluded that C/1846 O1 and C/1973 D1 were either genetically unrelated or related in a different manner. In any case, the process of high-order orbital-cascade resonance did not explain the required rate of inward aphelion drifting to complete satisfaction. Our computations showed that in the modeled motion of C/1846 O1 the peak perturbation rate, integrated over one revolution, of the reciprocal semimajor axis was close to 0.0010 $(AU)^{-1}$, whereas the rate, needed to explain the final orbital period in a general range of, say, 500–800 yr after not more than five returns to perihelion, was near 0.0017 $(AU)^{-1}$; such a rate would require [Equation (27)] a minimum distance of unachievable ∼0.5–0.6 AU rather than ∼0.9–1.0 AU (Tables 11–12) some 440 days after perihelion, at the critical time during the recurring encounters with Jupiter.

Comets C/1846 O1 and C/1973 D1 still could be genetically related, but their evolutionary paths must have differed from the examined scenario in one way or another (e.g., the parent's fragmentation event might have taken place one or more revolutions earlier). In a speculative example one may suggest a similar process, but accompanied in addition by a series of fragmentation events involving C/1846 O1 between the perihelion passages in the years −14 326 and 1846. While the resulting companions would probably fail to survive, the orbital motion of the primary would in each such event be affected by a momentum change, arriving at Jupiter at a slightly different time. As Jovian encounter-driven perturbations are highly time-sensitive and capable of magnifying the slight positional changes into more significant orbital-energy changes, the rate of inward aphelion drifting might increase appreciably and the orbital period shorten accordingly. A similar outcome may also be triggered by a nongravitational acceleration that could affect the comet's orbital motion. Other than that, we do not see a competing tractable interpretation of the two long-period comets as a genetically related pair.

Our comprehensive investigation of high-order orbital-cascade resonance has ramifications for the evolution of some comets. We remark in passing that the general problem of orbital perturbations in the presence of multiple encounters with a planet was touched upon — but dismissed as hardly tractable — by Everhart (1969) in connection with the now-solved problem of capturing comets into short-period orbits. Although the likelihood of orbital-cascade resonance among comets is relatively low, the process represents an attractive mechanism for a rapid rate of inward drifting of aphelia of long-period comets in general and of aphelia of the dynamically new, Oort-Cloud comets in particular. In the context of the

process of comet diffusion, the ultimate changes in the total orbital energy of comets subjected to Jovian-driven high-order cascade resonance exemplify effects that in terms of orbit-transformation severity compare favorably to effects triggered in the course of very close encounters with Jupiter, except that the latter do not require the orbital-period commensurability and happen instantly.

This research was carried out in part at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, under contract with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

REFERENCES

Argelander, F. W. A. 1865, AN, 63, 285
Bishop, G. 1852, Astronomical Observations Taken at the Observatory South Villa, Inner Circle, Regent's Park, London, During the Years 1839–1851. (London: Taylor, Walton, & Maberly), 215
Bortle, J. E. 1982, Intern. Comet Quart., 4, 79
Callandreau, O. 1892, Ann. Obs. Paris, 20, B.57
Carusi, A., Kresák, L., Perozzi, E., & Valsecchi, G. B. 1985, Long-Term Evolution of Short-Period Comets. (Bristol, UK: A. Hilger Ltd.)
Carusi, A., Kresák, L., Perozzi, E., & Valsecchi, G. B. 1986, in Exploration of Halley's Comet, ESA SP-250, ed. B. Battrick, E. J. Rolfe, & R. Reinhard (Nordwijk, Netherlands: ESTEC), vol. 2, 413
Carusi, A., Kresák, L., Perozzi, E., & Valsecchi, G. B. 1987a, A&A, 187, 899
Carusi, A., Valsecchi, G. B., Kresák, L., & Perozzi, E. 1987b, Publ. Astron. Inst. Czech. Acad. Sci., 67, 29
Combi, M. R., DiSanti, M. A., & Fink, U. 1997, Icarus, 130, 336
Danby, J. M. A. 1988, Fundamentals of Celestial Mechanics, 2nd ed. (Richmond, VA: Willmann-Bell Publ.), 466pp
de Vico, F. 1846, Comptes Rendus Acad. Sci. Paris, 23, 477
Dones, L., Weissman, P. R., Levison, H. F., & Duncan, M. J. 2004, in Comets II, ed. M. C. Festou, H. U. Keller, & H. A. Weaver (Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona), 153
Duncan, M., Levison, H., & Dones, L. 2004, in Comets II, ed. M. C. Festou, H. U. Keller, & H. A. Weaver (Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona), 193
Everhart, E. 1968, AJ, 73, 1039
Everhart, E. 1969, AJ, 74, 735
Everhart, E. 1972, in The Motion, Evolution of Orbits, and Origin of Comets, Proc. IAU Symp. 45, ed. G. A. Chebotarev, E. I. Kazimirchak-Polonskaya, & B. G. Marsden (Dordrecht, Netherlands: Reidel Publ.), 360
Fernández, J. A. 1981, A&A, 96, 26
Fernández, J. A., & Gallardo, T. 1994, A&A, 281, 911
Graham, A. 1846, MNRAS, 7, 160
Hind, J. R. 1846, AN, 24, 325
Kazimirchak-Polonskaya, E. I. 1967, Soviet Astron., 11, 349
Kazimirchak-Polonskaya, E. I. 1972, in The Motion, Evolution of Orbits, and Origin of Comets, IAU Symp. 45, ed. G. A. Chebotarev, E. I. Kazimirchak-Polonskaya, & B. G. Marsden (Dordrecht, Netherlands: Reidel), 373
Kohoutek, L. 1973a, IAU Circ., 2504
Kohoutek, L. 1973b, IAU Circ., 2593
Kojima, N. 1973, IAU Circ., 2511
Kresák, L'. 1982, Bull. Astron. Inst. Czech., 33, 150
Lagerstrom, P. A., & Kevorkian, J. 1963, AJ, 68, 84
Le Verrier, U.-J. 1857, Ann. Obs. Imp. Paris, 3, 203
Lévy, P. 1937, Théorie de l'Addition des Variables Aléatoires. (Paris: Gauthier-Villiers).
Lexell, A. I. 1778, Acta Acad. Petropol., 1, 317
Lindblad, B. A. 1985, in Dynamics of Comets: Their Origin and Evolution, Proc. IAU Coll. 83, ed. A. Carusi & G. B. Valsecchi (Dordrecht, Netherlands: Reidel Publ.), 353
Marsden, B. G. 1967, AJ, 72, 1170
Marsden, B. G. 1973, IAU Circ., 2504
Marsden, B. G. 1974, IAU Circ., 2646
Marsden, B. G. 1979, Catalogue of Cometary Orbits, 3rd ed. (Cambridge, MA: Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory)
Marsden, B. G. 1989, AJ, 98, 2306
Marsden, B. G., & Williams, G. V. 2008, Catalogue of Cometary Orbits 2008, 17th ed. (Cambridge, MA: Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory)
Marsden, B. G., Sekanina, Z., & Yeomans, D. K. 1973, AJ, 78, 211
Marsden, B. G., Sekanina, Z., & Everhart, E. 1978, AJ, 83, 64
Morbidelli, A., & Brown, M. E. 2004, in Comets II, ed. M. C. Festou, H. U. Keller, & H. A. Weaver (Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona), 175
Morris, C. S. 1973, PASP, 85, 470
Öpik, E. J. 1966, Irish Astron. J., 7, 141
Öpik, E. J. 1971, Irish Astron. J., 10, 35
Rickman, H. 2004, in Comets II, ed. M. C. Festou, H. U. Keller, & H. A. Weaver (Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona), 205
Sekanina, Z. 1982, in Comets, ed. L. L. Wilkening (Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona), 251
Sekanina, Z., & Chodas, P. W. 2004, ApJ, 607, 620
Sekanina, Z., & Kracht, R. 2016, ApJ, 823, 2 (Paper 1)
Sekanina, Z., & Yeomans, D. K. 1984, AJ, 89, 154
Shlesinger, M. F., West, B. J., & Klafter, J. 1987, Phys. Rev. Lett., 58, 1100
Sitarski, G. 1968, Acta Astron., 18, 171
Southworth, R. B., & Hawkins, G. S. 1963, Smithson. Contr. Astrophys., 7, 261
Šteins, K., & Kronkalne, S. 1964, Acta Astron., 14, 311
van Woerkom, A. J. J. 1948, BAN, 10, 445
Vogel, H. 1868, AN, 71, 97
Vsekhsvyatsky, S. K. 1958, Fizicheskie kharakteristiki komet (Moscow: Gosud. izd-vo fiz.-mat. lit.); translated: 1964, Physical Characteristics of Comets, NASA TT-F-80 (Jerusalem: Israel Program for Scientific Translations)
Whipple, F. L. 1977, Icarus, 30, 736
Zhou, J.-L., Sun, Y.-S., & Zhou, L.-Y. 2002, Cel. Mech. & Dyn. Astron., 84, 409